TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	No. and Name.	Date.	Subject.	Page
1	Sir G. Clerk... ... (Constantinople) **No. 207**	1932 June 21	Saudi-Turkish relations ... ... Reports on visit of Emir Feisal to Turkey	1
2	... ...	July 2	Italo-Turkish territorial waters ... ... Text of Italo-Turkish Agreement of 4th January, 1932, regarding delimitation of waters between Castellorizo and the Turkish coast	2
3	League of Nations...	July 15	Turkey and the League of Nations ... ... Text of Assembly's resolution of 6th July, 1932, regarding invitation to Turkey to become a member of the League of Nations	4
4	League of Nations...	July 15	Turkey and the League of Nations ... ... Turkish Government's reply to the Assembly's invitation to Turkey to become a member of the League of Nations (see No. 3)	4
5	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 236**	July 10	Turkey and the League of Nations ... ... Reports on debate in Turkish Assembly on League's invitation to Turkey to become a member. Invitation clearly gave much pleasure	5
6	Mr. Palairet... ... (Bucharest) **No. 24. Tel. Saving**	July 12	Straits Convention ... ... Minister for Foreign Affairs' enquiry whether Turkey had approached His Majesty's Government regarding a possible revision of the Straits Convention. Question of considerable interest to Roumania	6
7	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 237**	July 12	Turkey and the League of Nations ... ... Refers to No. 5. Reports Turkish appreciation of speeches made at Geneva on occasion of issue of invitation to Turkey to join the League. Letter addressed to Soviet Chargé d'Affaires by Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs	6
8	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 241**	July 19	Turkish finances ... ... Refers to Part XXIII, No. 35. Reports budget for 1932-33 voted by Assembly. Analyses its provisions	7
9	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 247**	July 20	Franco-Turkish relations ... ... Refers to Part XXIII, No. 56. Reports changed tone of Turkish press and tribute paid in *République* to M. Heriot	8
10	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 249**	July 21	Turkish Historical Congress ... ... Reports on establishment and functioning, under the Gazi's auspices, of the Historical Research Commission and proceedings of Congress, and discusses Gazi's probable object—to give the Turks a tradition and heritage which would be an object of their pride	8
11	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 250**	July 21	Turkish political situation ... ... Transmits and comments on report by military attaché on conversations with the ex-Khedive Latter's opinion that the Gazi had lost much of his power. Relations between Gazi and Ismet Pasha obscure	10

No.	No. and Name.	Date.	Subject.	Page
12	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 257**	1932 July 23	Turkey and the League of Nations ... ... Refers to No. 7. Transmits and comments on further letter addressed by Minister for Foreign Affairs to Soviet Chargé d'Affaires in connexion with Turkey's entry into League. Letter is similar to that sent by the Germans to the Soviets in 1926	12
13	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 258**	July 24	Italo-Turkish relations ... ... Reports details of Italian naval visit to Constantinople. Comments on absence of exchange of civilities and hospitality with Turkish naval authorities	14
14	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 266**	Aug. 1	Straits Convention ... ... Reports denial by President of Straits Commission of report that Soviets were pressing Turkey to raise the question of the abolition of international control or to demand the revision of the convention	15
15	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 299**	Aug. 29	Turkish Linguistic Conference ... ... Refers to No. 10. Reports on Gazi's ethnological studies and conclusions which have given rise to the holding of the conference. Regrets that Gazi should have become so obsessed by his studies, results of which may create ridicule abroad	15
16	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 310**	Sept. 18	Anglo-Turkish relations ... ... Reports on passing naval visit on 16th September. Explains misunderstanding which arose regarding salute	17
17	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 311**	Sept. 18	Turkish Cabinet ... ... Reports and comments on appointment of Celal Bey as Minister of National Economy. Draws attention to importance of appointment, as radical measures are required to improve the economic situation	17
18	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 317**	Sept. 29	Turkish Cabinet ... ... Reports appointment of Rezit Galip Bey as Minister of Public Instruction. Official denial of report that further changes are contemplated	17
19	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 326**	Oct. 1	Turkish Cabinet ... ... Refers to Nos. 17 and 18, and comments further on Cabinet changes. The appointment of a new Minister of National Economy is the more important change. Circumstances which brought it about	19
20	To Sir G. Clerk ... **No. 395**	Oct. 10	Saudi-Turkish relations ... ... Record of conversation with Turkish Ambassador, who stated that Turks were supplying Ibn Saud with 100 rifles. Ambassador drew attention to improper language used in Cyprus by a Turk called Merut and enquired whether anything could be done to prevent a repetition	20
21	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 334**	Oct. 13	Turkish Linguistic Congress ... ... Reports proceedings of congress and speeches delivered. Old Turkish words are being searched out and a new language is to be created	21

	No. and Name.	Date.	Subject.	Page
22	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 347**	1932 Oct. 29	Syrian-Turkish relations ... ... Reports signature on 27th October of protocol concerning Turkish properties in Syria and Syrian properties in Turkey and of provisional railway agreement. Conclusion of agreements is largely due to French Ambassador, who has brought about great improvement in Franco-Turkish relations	23
23	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 350**	Oct. 29	Perso-Turkish relations ... ... Reports arrival in Turkey on official visit of Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Ferughi Khan's statements to the press	23
24	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 352**	Oct. 31	Perso-Turkish relations ... ... Minister for Foreign Affairs' statement regarding matters to be discussed with Persian Minister for Foreign Affairs. Existing treaties will probably be remodelled, and relations with neighbours of the two countries reviewed	24
25	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 353**	Oct. 31	Middle-East Security Pact .. .. Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs' suggestion for conclusion of pact of non-aggression between Turkey, Persia and Iraq, and to which His Majesty's Government might be a party. Minister for Foreign Affairs promised to develop his idea later, but thought His Majesty's Government's withdrawal from Treaty of Angora might provide occasion for conclusion of pact	25
26	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 354**	Nov. 2	Turkish Assembly ... ... Reports opening on 1st November. President's speech was colourless, especially as regards foreign relations, and for the most part was received in silence	25
27	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 355**	Nov. 2	Republic Day in Turkey ... ... Report on celebration at Angora, where proceedings were on usual lines. Crowd got temporarily out of hand at conclusion of parade	26
28	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 356**	Nov. 2	Republic Day in Angora ... ... Refers to No. 27. Reports on proceedings at dinner to heads of missions and subsequent ball. Incident in connexion with Egyptian Minister's fez, and Gazi's conversation with heads of various missions	27
29	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 362**	Nov. 8	Perso-Turkish relations ... ... Refers to No. 24. Reports signature of treaties of friendship and of neutrality, and political and economic co-operation, and of provisional extradition agreement. Communiqué issued after Persian Minister for Foreign Affairs' visit	29
30	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 363**	Nov. 9	Proposed Middle-East Non-Aggression Pact ... Refers to No. 25. Reports Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs' suggestion for pact between Turkey, Iraq and Persia, to which he proposed that His Majesty's Government should be a party. Transmits memorandum by Mr. Morgan containing further information regarding Minister for Foreign Affairs' scheme	30
31	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 365**	Nov. 6	Syrian-Turkish relations ... ... Refers to No. 22. Information received from French Ambassador regarding Properties and Railway Agreements signed on 27th October	32

	No. and Name.	Date.	Subject.	Page
32	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 367**	1932 Nov. 12	Franco-Turkish relations ... ... Reports on enthusiasm in Turkish Assembly at receipt from French Chamber of congratulations on Turkey's entry into the League. Improvement in Franco-Turkish relations is marked	33
33	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 368**	Nov. 12	American customs specialist for Turkey ... ... Reports that Mr. Vorfelt has taken up his duties	34
34	Mr. Morgan ... ... (Constantinople) **No. 370**	Nov. 12	Perso-Turkish relations ... ... Reports exchange of ratifications of Frontier Agreement and of an agreement covering questions of arbitration, conciliation and judicial procedure	34
35	Sir G. Clerk... ... **No. 372**	Nov. 12	Syria-Turkish Railway Agreement ... ... Transmits text of agreement signed on 27th October	34
36	Mr. Morgan... ... **No. 19. Tel.**	Dec. 9	Egyptian-Turkish relations ... ... Egyptian Government's note to Turkey regarding removal of Minister's fez at Republic Day dinner. Incident is denied and there is a tendency to brazen the matter out. *Daily Herald* and Reuter are also blamed for giving publicity to alleged incident	37
37	Mr. Morgan... ... **No. 399**	Dec. 10	Egyptian-Turkish relations ... ... Refers to No. 28. Reports storm which has arisen as a result of removal of Egyptian Minister's fez. False version of incident published in Turkey. Hopes that matter may sink into oblivion	38
38	Sir P. Loraine ... (Cairo) **No. 224. Tel.**	Dec. 16	Fez incident ... ... Refers to No. 28. Danger of rupture between Egypt and Turkey. Reports that, in conversations with Turkish Chargé d'Affaires and Sidky Pasha, he has exerted his influence in a calming sense	39
39	To Sir P. Loraine ... **No. 247. Tel.**	Dec. 19	Fez incident ... ... Refers to No. 38. Approves language and trusts he will have further opportunity of promoting early and favourable settlement	40
40	Sir P. Loraine ... **No. 229. Tel.**	Dec. 23	Fez incident ... ... Refers to No. 39. Substance of Turkish reply to Egyptian note and of draft Egyptian reply, which, as subsequently modified, is entirely conciliatory. Suggests moderating influence at Angora	40
41	Sir P. Loraine ... **No. 232. Tel. Conf.**	Dec. 26	Fez incident ... ... Refers to No. 40. Has received final text of Egyptian reply, which is wholly commendable. If Turks reject it, it will be clear that they wish to pick a quarrel	41
42	To Mr. Morgan ... **No. 35. Tel.**	Dec. 28	Fez incident ... ... Refers to No. 40. Leaves any informal moderating influence to his discretion	41
43	Mr. Morgan... ... **No. 21. Tel.**	Dec. 29	Fez incident ... ... Refers to No. 42. Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs urged to accept Egyptian reply as closing the incident. Under-Secretary paid a tribute to moderating influence of His Majesty's Government, and said that telegraphic summary of Egyptian note was entirely satisfactory	41

No. and Name.	Date.	Subject.	Page
	1932		
44 Mr. Morgan... ... **No. 407**	Dec. 19	Turkish railways ... ... Reports establishment of through railway communication between Samsun, Angora and Mersin	42
45 Mr. Morgan... ... **No. 411**	Dec. 20	Perso-Turkish relations ... ... Refers to No. 29. Transmits texts of treaties of friendship and of neutrality and political and economic co-operation	42

Subject Index.

[The figures refer to serial numbers of documents.]

American Customs specialist for Turkey.—33.
Anglo-Turkish relations.—16.
Arabia—*see* Saudi Arabia.
Assembly, Turkish.—26.
Bagdad Railway.—35.
Budget, Turkish.—8.
Cabinet, Turkish.—17–19.
Customs adviser.—33.
Egyptian-Turkish relations—*see* Fez incident.
Fez incident.—36–43.
Finances, Turkish.—8.
Franco-Turkish relations.—9, 32.
Italo-Turkish relations.—13.
Italo-Turkish territorial waters.—2.
League of Nations, Turkey and.—3–5, 6, 12.
Middle-East Security Pact.—25, 30.
Naval visits.—13, 16.
Perso-Turkish relations.—23, 24, 29, 34, 45.
Political situation, Turkish.—11, 17–19.
Railways, Syrian-Turkish.—35.
Railways, Turkish.—44.
Republic Day celebrations.—27, 28.
Saudi Arabia-Turkish Relations.—1, 20.
Straits Convention.—6, 14.
Syrian-Turkish relations.—22, 31, 35.
Territorial waters—*see* Italo-Turkish territorial waters.
Turkish Historical Congress.—10.
Turkish Linguistic Conference.—15, 21.

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office.

CONFIDENTIAL.

Further Correspondence respecting Turkey.

Part XXIV.

[E 3277/1494/25] No. 1.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received July 1.)

(No. 207.)

Sir, *Constantinople, June 21, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to report that on the 8th June His Highness the Emir Feisal, son of the King of Hejaz-Nejd, arrived in Constantinople by Soviet steamer from Odessa. He was accompanied to Turkey by M. Florinski, Soviet Marshal of the Diplomatic Corps, and both on his arrival and during his stay in Turkey has been the object of assiduous attentions on the part of members of the Soviet Embassy.

2. After a short stay in Constantinople, the Emir, with his suite, among whom were Fuad Hamza Bey, deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Halid Eyubi Bey, aide-de-camp, left for Angora in a special saloon coach placed at their disposal by the Turkish Government, and was the guest of the Government from the 12th to the 15th June, afterwards returning to Constantinople, where he is to spend a few days before leaving for Tehran via the Caucasus, and thence for Bagdad.

3. While at Angora the Emir was received by the President of the Republic, who gave a dinner in his honour at his new residence at Cankaya, and was the guest at banquets or receptions given by Ismet Pasha, Tevfik Rüştü Bey, Kâzim Pasha, President of the Grand National Assembly, and Hikmet Bey, secretary-general of the Gazi. In deference to the opinions of the Emir, no alcoholic refreshments were served at these gatherings. In his turn, the Emir gave a dinner to the President of the Republic and leading Turks. Before leaving Angora the Emir had an amicable conversation at the Iraq Legation with His Highness the Emir Zeid, Minister of Iraq and brother to the King of that country.

4. In the course of the dinner given at Cankaya by the President of the Republic, speeches were exchanged which, while on conventional lines, were marked with slightly more restraint on the Wahabi than on the Turkish side. The Gazi expressed his pleasure at the efforts which were being made to set the Hejaz and Nejd on the way of progress, and his best wishes for the future of those countries under the strong administration of King Abdulaziz, while the Emir confined himself to acknowledging with thanks the Gazi's wishes and reciprocating them. The official communiqué issued on the conclusion of the visit referred to cordial and sincere conversations, harmony of views, feelings of mutual confidence, and the influence of that visit on the consolidation of peace in the Near East.

5. The time between banquets was devoted to inspections of banking and military establishments. In this latter connexion it is noticeable that the visit of the Emir to Turkey is distinguished from that of other important personages by the exhibition to him of part of Turkey's military resources, and by the rather unusual participation, in his reception and in his send-off, of high military authorities. The Emir was shown over military factories and barracks, under the guidance of Ali Sait Pasha, Army Inspector; he assisted at tactical exercises,

was present at a display of military horsemanship, and witnessed an aerial review in which some twenty-five military aeroplanes from Eskişehir took part. One of these flew into an obstacle when starting and the pilot was killed. The others indulged in formation flying, which to a lay observer seemed rather ragged, but the diving and other acrobatic feats seemed temerarious but successful.

6. Press comment on the visit is curiously unanimous in insisting that Turkey's interest in Hejaz and Nejd arises out of pleasure at their having won complete independence, and in declaring that it is, and always has been, Turkey's desire that Moslem States detached from the Ottoman Empire should have complete independence. For this reason she has always disliked the term "mandate," which signifies subjection. She had only consented to cede the Vilayet of Mosul because the cession was to be made to an independent Iraq. The line to be followed in regard to Syria by France, which is at present enjoying a "bad press" in Turkey, is thus clearly indicated. Yunus Nadi, writing as usual with his tongue in his cheek, after proclaiming Turkey's yearning for the independence of her former possessions, praises the austere organiser of the Hejaz and Nejd who has obtained independence for his subjects, has endowed them with a strong Government, dealing out severe justice and ruling with iron discipline, and he concludes with an outburst of joy at the progress made by the Arab peoples, Turkey's co-religionists.

7. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister at Jedda.

I have, &c.

GEORGE R. CLERK.

C 5501/411/22

No. 2.

Italo-Turkish Agreement of January 4, 1932, regarding the Delimitation of Territorial Waters between the Island of Castellorizo and the Coast of Anatolia.—(Received in Foreign Office, July 2, 1932.)

LE Gouvernement royal d'Italie, représenté par son Excellence le Baron Pompeo Aloisi, Ambassadeur extraordinaire et plénipotentiaire en Turquie, d'une part, et le Gouvernement de la République turque, représenté par son Excellence M. le Dr. Tevfik Rüştü Bey, Ministre des Affaires étrangères, Député d'Izmir, d'autre part, animés du désir de maintenir et de consolider davantage les relations de sincère amitié qui fort heureusement existent entre eux, ont décidé de régler par un arrangement direct le différend surgi entre l'Italie et la Turquie au sujet de la souveraineté sur les îlots situés entre les côtes d'Anatolie et l'île de Castellorizo, ainsi que sur l'îlot de Kara-Ada et de procéder à la délimitation des eaux territoriales environnant lesdits îlots dont l'appartenance a fait l'objet d'une contestation entre eux, à la suite de l'interprétation des dispositions y relatives du Traité de Lausanne.

Les soussignés, après avoir exhibé leurs pleins pouvoirs, reconnus en bonne et due forme, sont tombés d'accord sur les points suivants :

ARTICLE 1er.

Le Gouvernement italien reconnait la souveraineté de la Turquie sur les îlots ci-dessous dénommés :

Volo (Çatal-Ada), Ochendra (Uvendire), Fournachia (Furnakya), Kato Volo (Katovolo), Prassoudi (Prasudi) (au sud-est de Catovolo). Les îlots de Tchatallota, Pighi, Nissi-Tis-Pighi, Récif Agricelia, Prousseciiss (Rocher), Pano Makri, Kato Makri (et les rochers compris), Marathi, Roccie Voutzaky (Rocci Vutchaki), Dacia (Dasya), Nissi-Tis-Dacia, Prassoudi (au nord de Dacia), Alimentarya (Alimentaria), Caravola (Karavola).

ARTICLE 2.

L'îlot de Kara-Ada, situé dans la baie de Bodrum, appartiendra également à la Turquie.

ARTICLE 3.

Par contre, le Gouvernement turc reconnait la souveraineté de l'Italie sur les îlots situés dans la zone délimitée par une circonférence qui aura pour centre le dôme de l'église de la ville de Castellorizo et pour rayon la distance entre ledit centre et le cap San-Stephano (point du vent), à savoir : Psoradia, Polyphados, St. Georges (deux îles dénommées dans la carte anglaise N. 236 : St. Georges, celle du sud, et Agrielaia, celle du nord).

Psomi (Strongylo, carte anglaise 236), Cutsumbora (Koutsoumbas) (Rochers), Mavro Poinaki (Mavro Poinachi), Mavro Poinis (Mavro Poini).

En dehors de ces îlots compris dans la circonférence précitée, les îlots de St. Georges (Rho), Dragonera, Ross et Hypsili (Stronghyli) appartiendront également à l'Italie.

ARTICLE 4.

Il est bien entendu que toutes les îles et tous les îlots et rochers se trouvant des deux côtés de la ligne de délimitation des eaux définie par la présente convention, que leurs noms y aient été mentionnés ou non, appartiennent à l'État sous la souveraineté duquel se trouve placée la zone où lesdites îles et îlots et rochers sont situés.

ARTICLE 5.

Les hautes parties contractantes sont également tombées d'accord pour fixer la délimitation des eaux territoriales comme suit :

A l'Est :

D'un point situé à moitié distance entre le cap San-Stephano (point du vent) et le cap Gata ;

De là, en ligne droite jusqu'à un point situé à moitié distance entre Psomi et Prousseciiss (Prussekli) ;

De ce point, en ligne droite sur un point situé à moitié distance entre Mavro-Poinis et Prousseciiss ;

De ce point, en ligne droite sur un point situé à moitié distance entre la pointe Niphtis et le rocher Prousseciiss ;

De ce dernier point, en ligne droite sur un point situé à moitié distance entre la côte nord-est de l'île d'Hypsili (Stronghyli) et la côte sud-ouest de l'île de Nissi-Tis-Dacia ;

De ce point, en ligne droite jusqu'à un point qui se trouve à 3 milles au sud de Tugh-Burnu.

Au Sud :

De ce dernier point, la ligne passe jusqu'à un point situé à 3 milles au sud de la pointe Sud Hypsili pour se joindre à la frontière maritime qui ne rentre pas en discussion.

Au Nord :

Du point situé à moitié distance entre le cap San-Stephano (point du vent) et cap Gata, la ligne va en ligne droite à un point situé à moitié distance entre le cap San-Stephano (point du vent) et le cap Vathy ;

De ce point, en ligne droite jusqu'à un point situé à moitié distance entre le cap du Limenari et les rochers Voutzaki (Rocci Vutzaki) ;

De ce dernier point, jusqu'à un point situé à moitié distance entre l'île Dragonera et les rochers Voutzaki (Rocci Vutchaki) ;

De ce dernier point, la ligne passe vers le nord jusqu'à un point situé à moitié distance entre le point nord-est de l'île St. Georges (Rho) et le point le plus proche de la côte d'Anatolie au nord du point de l'île ;

De ce point, jusqu'à un point situé à moitié distance entre Prassoudi et le point sud-ouest de l'île St. Georges (Rho) ;

De ce dernier point, la ligne va en ligne droite jusqu'à un point situé à 3 milles au sud de l'île de Volo pour se joindre à la frontière maritime qui ne rentre pas en discussion.

La ligne de démarcation, telle qu'elle est décrite dans le présent article, fixée par les hautes parties contractantes en vue de déterminer l'appartenance des

iles et ilots se trouvant de part et d'autre de cette ligne, rejoint à l'est à un point situé à 3 milles de distance au sud de Tugh-Burnu, et à l'ouest à un point situé à 3 milles de distance au sud de l'île de Volo, la frontière maritime générale qui n'est point en discussion entre la Turquie et l'Italie.

ARTICLE 6.

Les noms des localités susmentionnées sont empruntés aux cartes italienne (624), française (5551) et anglaise (236).

Les hautes parties contractantes sont d'accord qu'en cas de divergence entre le texte de la présente convention et les cartes y annexées, c'est le texte qui fera foi.

ARTICLE 7.

La présente convention sera ratifiée et les ratifications en seront échangées à Rome aussitôt que faire se pourra.

Elle entrera en vigueur quinze jours après la date de l'échange des ratifications.

En foi de quoi, les plénipotentiaires des hautes parties contractantes ont signé la présente convention et y ont apposé leurs sceaux.

Fait en double exemplaire à Ankara, le 4 janvier 1932.

ALOISI. T. RUSTU.

W 8081/4372/98

No. 3.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Resolution regarding an Invitation to Turkey to become a Member of the League of Nations, adopted by the Assembly on July 6, 1932.—(Received in Foreign Office, July 15.)

THE Assembly,

Recognising that the Turkish Republic fulfils the general conditions laid down in article 1 of the Covenant for a State to become a member of the League of Nations,

Decides that the Turkish Republic shall be invited to enter the League of Nations and to give it the benefit of its valuable co-operation.

And instructs the Secretary-General to take such action as may be necessary in pursuance of this resolution.

Geneva, July 6, 1932.

W 8079/4372/98

No. 4.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Reply from the Turkish Government to the Invitation to become a Member of the League of Nations.—(Received in Foreign Office, July 15.)

Note by the Secretary-General.

Geneva, July 11, 1932.

THE Secretary-General has the honour to communicate to the Assembly the Turkish Government's reply to the invitation extended to it to become a member of the League of Nations under the Assembly resolution of the 6th July, 1932.

Tevfik Rüştü to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations.

Sir, *Ankara, July 9, 1932.*

In reply to the invitation which you transmitted to me on behalf of the Assembly, I have the honour to inform you that the Turkish Republic is prepared to become a member of the League of Nations, and that the obligations assumed by Turkey under the treaties concluded hitherto, including those concluded with States non-members of the League of Nations, are in no way incompatible with the duties of a member of the League of Nations. In this connexion, I would point out that all the treaties signed before the admission of Turkey have been concluded in the spirit of the Pact of Paris, to which the majority of the members of the League of Nations are also signatories.

In making this declaration it is my duty to add that Turkey is in a special position as a consequence of military obligations ensuing from the conventions signed at Lausanne on the 24th July, 1923.

Such being the case, I desire to recall the terms of the note which was signed by the representatives of Belgium, France, the British Empire, Italy, Poland and Czechoslovakia on the 1st December, 1925, and which was quoted by the German Government in its letter of the 8th February, 1926, to the Secretary-General, concerning the admission of Germany to the League of Nations. The last paragraph of that note read as follows:—

> "The obligations resulting from the said article (article 16) on the members of the League must be understood to mean that each State member of the League is bound to co-operate loyally and effectively in support of the Covenant and in resistance to any act of aggression, to an extent which is compatible with its military situation, and takes its geographical position into account."

I have, &c.

TEVFIK RÜSTÜ,

Minister for Foreign Affairs.

W 8073/4372/98

No. 5.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received July 15.)

(No. 236.)

Sir, *Constantinople, July 10, 1932.*

WITH reference to my telegram No. 14 of the 9th instant, regarding Turkey's acceptance of the invitation to join the League of Nations, I have the honour to report that the Grand National Assembly, which was to have risen on the 3rd July, continued in session until yesterday, for the express purpose of waiting for the arrival of the invitation and of approving the reply to it.

2. The note of yesterday's proceedings was one of enthusiasm and pleasure, roused particularly by the warmth of the invitation and the eulogistic references to Turkey in the speeches of the representatives of various nations at Geneva. Tevfik Rüştü Bey, in asking the Grand National Assembly to approve the text of the reply of the Turkish Government to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, said that it was clear that the nations cherished for Kemalist Turkey the same cordial and sincere feelings which animated Turkey towards them. The text of the reply was unanimously approved, and is to-day published in the press. In it the Turkish Government states that the agreements made by Turkey with other States, some of which were not members of the League of Nations, were not incompatible with the obligations of a member of the League, and that they were in harmony with the spirit of the Pact of Paris. Certain sections, of a military nature, of the Treaty of Lausanne, signed on the 24th July, 1923, were however, in a special category. The Turkish Government then adds that it invites a reference to a note of the 1st December, 1925, quoted by Germany in a letter which it sent to the Secretary-General of the League on the 8th February, 1926, on the subject of Germany's entry into the League, and especially to the last paragraph of the note, which pointed out that the engagements assumed under article 16 by members of the League of Nations signify that members are obliged, as far as their military and geographical situation permits, to co-operate loyally in assuring respect for the pact and preventing aggression.

3. It will be seen that the reply does not specifically state that Turkey accepts the invitation to join the League, but rather gives Turkey's interpretation of the conditions on which it enters. The decision which Turkey has been hesitating to take for the past four years is now, however, taken. It will be remembered that Turkey, in the beginning, expressed determination not to join unless pressed to do so, and unless offered a permanent or semi-permanent seat on the Council. Time went by without any offer of this nature being forthcoming, and it almost began to appear to Turkey that even an invitation to enter the League without any bribe was unlikely to materialise, and that she might have to apply for membership, a more humiliating affair than being offered membership and more difficult to explain to Russia. A chance remark of the Spanish representative came at this juncture, and enabled Tevfik Rüştü to let it be known that Turkey had been invited to become a member, and since then events have moved quickly to culminate now.

4. It is clear that the desire of Turkey to enter the League was greater than that of the League for its adhesion. Turkey obviously desires to be present on terms of equality at gatherings of the chief representatives of other countries, and the fact of her entry into the League marks the definite advance of Turkey from a nation suspecting that it is regarded as inferior by others to one now treated with respect and on equal terms by all.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

E 3599/2/44

No. 6.

Mr. Palairet to Sir John Simon.—(*Received July* 18.)

(No. 24. Saving.)
(Telegraphic.) R.

Bucharest, July 12, 1932.

UNDER-SECRETARY of State for Foreign Affairs asked me a few days ago whether it was true that Turkish Government, now that Turkey was joining League of Nations, had approached His Majesty's Government in regard to a revision of Straits Convention. If so, in what form had question been raised and how would His Majesty's Government reply? Question greatly interested Roumania.

I told him I had no information and would communicate his enquiry to you if next bag did not enlighten me.

I see no reference to matter in last print or sections, so should be glad to know what to reply.

(Repeated to Constantinople.)

W 8237/4372/98

No. 7.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received July* 20.)

(No. 237.)
Sir,

Constantinople, July 12, 1932.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 236 of the 10th instant, regarding the entry of Turkey into the League of Nations, I have the honour to report that the French text of Turkey's reply to the invitation of the League is now available, and differs in some respects from the summary given in my previous despatch. I enclose a copy(1) of the French text, from which it will be seen that Turkey expresses her readiness to become a member of the League, and states that her obligations under existing treaties (apart from certain obligations arising out of the Treaty of Lausanne of the 24th July, 1923) are not incompatible with the duties of a member of the League.

2. The tone of the speeches of representatives of various States at Geneva, on the occasion of the issue of the invitation to Turkey to become a member of the League, especially those of the British and Australian delegates, have aroused so

(1) Not printed.

much enthusiasm that Tevfik Rüştü has telegraphed his thanks to each representative. The telegrams to the Australian delegate, to Lord Londonderry, to M. Paul-Boncour, M. Scialoja and to M. Michalacopoulos are very cordially worded. In addition, Tevfik Rüştü has announced that he will inform non-members of the League, namely, the United States, Brazil, Afghanistan, &c., of the receipt of the invitation by Turkey, and that he has addressed a letter, of which I enclose the text, to the Soviet Chargé d'Affaires in Angora.(1) The necessity for the publication of this letter is not obvious, unless one assumes that Tevfik Rüştü has twinges of conscience in regard to his Russian friends. He himself states that the intention of the letter was that everything should be open and above board.

3. The thanks of Turkey to States in which Turkey has no diplomatic representative are to be conveyed to their missions in London through the Turkish Chargé d'Affaires. Asked why he had chosen the Chargé d'Affaires in London and not the Turkish representative in any other capital to perform this task, Tevfik Rüştü said that His Majesty's Government had always supported the Turkish point of view in regard to the League, and that it would be a mark of gratitude to His Majesty's Government to give instructions that these communications should be made in London.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

E 3825/70/44

No. 8.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received July* 28.)

(No. 241.)
Sir,

Constantinople, July 19, 1932.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 136 of the 13th April, I have the honour to inform you that the budget for the financial year 1932-33 was voted by the Grand National Assembly on the 26th June last.

2. It will be observed, by reference to the attached tables(1) of approved estimates of revenue and expenditure, that these estimates show a marked reduction as compared to the approved estimates for the preceding year, revenue being established at £T. 169,354,800 as compared to £T. 186,705,599 for the year 1931–32, and expenditure at £T. 169,146,747 as against £T. 186,582,005.

3. Revenue in 1931–32 fell considerably short of approved estimates, and, therefore, in order to reduce the large deficit facing the Turkish Government on the budget estimates, the Ministry of Finance, the People's party and Budget Commission were obliged, in addition to cuts in expenditure, to impose a "crisis" tax as from the 1st December last. In this manner the budget deficit, which it was believed would have attained £T. 33,500,000, was reduced to £T. 10 million.

4. In establishing the budget estimates for the period under review (1932–33), a very careful scrutiny of financial and economic conditions was effected by the Budget Commission, as the result of which it was estimated that revenue would not exceed £T. 143,604,800, and, therefore, to meet estimated expenditure, an additional sum of £T. 25,750,000 had to be found by the imposition of additional taxation.

5. The analysis attached to the tables of revenue and expenditure forming appendices(1) to this despatch has been drawn up by the Ottoman Bank as the result of a survey of the parliamentary debates, and of the "Official Journal," and was furnished to the commercial secretary confidentially. It contains a very complete account of the situation.

6. Practically all departmental votes have been cut down, but the savings shown under the Departments of National Defence and Public Works in the table of approved estimates of expenditure are fictitious; being in reality £T. 5,500,000 for the Ministry of National Defence and £T. 6,500,000 for the Ministry of Public Works.

7. The increase in the vote granted under the heading "Public Debt" represents the transfer of credits figuring previously in the budgets of the

(1) Not printed.

Ministry of National Defence, Ministry of Public Works and Ministry of Finance in respect of Government commitments in connexion with armaments and railway construction.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

P.S.—I am sending a copy of this despatch to the Department of Overseas Trade.

G. R. C.

[E 3828/2984/44]

No. 9.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received July* 28.)

(No. 247.)

Constantinople, July 20, 1932.

Sir,

WITH reference to my despatch No. 200 of the 9th June enclosing an extract from the "République" in which strong exception was taken to the attitude of the "Temps" towards this country and to French policy towards Turkey, I have the honour to report that an article of a very different complexion appears in to-day's issue of the same journal.

2. The article, which is signed by Yunus Nadi, the editor, expresses gratification at the motion of congratulation recently passed by the French Chamber on the occasion of Turkey's entry into the League. A fulsome tribute is paid to M. Herriot who, it is suggested, might worthily take the place of Marianne as the symbolic representative of France, and his words about the traditional friendship of the two countries are reproduced in heavy type.

3. The concluding portion of the article is less lyrically worded. Regret is expressed at the occasional exhibitions of animosity towards Turkey which occur in France and which must, the writer thinks, be attributed to some "fundamental unfriendliness," though he does not accuse the French nation as a whole of cherishing such feelings. Indeed, he regards the present manifestation as a welcome proof to the contrary. As for Turkey, she wishes well to all countries and not least to France, of whose friendship she has just received such generous reassurance. The moral of the article would appear to be: "Let bygones be bygones."

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 3822/3822/44]

No. 10.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received July* 28.)

(No. 249.)

Constantinople, July 21, 1932.

Sir,

TWO years ago the Gazi, seeking to fill the time which lies heavy on his hands at Cankaya, absorbed into his system a stimulating but inadequate draught of the Pierian waters, and became conscious of the existence of a light which, but for his initiative, would in all probability have still remained concealed beneath the Turkish bushel, namely, the prominent rôle played by Turks in bygone ages in the creation and development of our modern civilisation. An ungrateful world had, he perceived, quite failed to appreciate or even to acknowledge the considerable achievements of its Turkish ancestors, and the time had come to make it clear to all and sundry exactly to whom the nations were really indebted for the benefits of civilisation. The immediate outcome of this initiative was the formation of a Turkish Historical Research Commission, which was charged with the task of sifting and collecting evidence which would substantiate and establish the remarkable theory above indicated.

2. As the work of the Historical Research Commission proceeded, the results of its labours have been published at intervals in the form of an official Turkish history, the use of which has been made compulsory in all schools in the country. With the intention of concentrating a still wider range of attention on the results of its activities, the commission has recently, at the Gazi's instigation, convoked a Historical Congress which sat in Angora from the 2nd to the 11th July, and

which was composed of some 200 professors and teachers of history, archæologists, anthropologists and the members of the commission, many of whom delivered addresses which were followed with close attention by the Gazi, members of the Cabinet, Deputies and representatives of the press.

3. With a single exception, the speakers scrupulously and loyally confined themselves to elaborating and establishing the theory conceived by the Gazi that modern civilisation rests upon a Turkish foundation, whether it be European or Asiatic, the main theme, which they never seemed to tire of reiterating, being that the Turks originally moved westwards from Central Asia, and were responsible for the establishment of the first civilised communities in Western Asia and in Europe. It was maintained that the Aryans were Turks, and that any distinction drawn between them was false; all the credit which had been given to the Aryans for their achievements was therefore due to the Turks. Similarly, the great Mesopotamian civilisation was Turkish, for not only was Abu Muslim, the founder of the Abbaside dynasty in Bagdad, a Turk, but so also were the succeeding chiefs of that line and the greater part of the leading Islamic philosophers. The Ionian civilisation too, which was the forerunner of the Ægean civilisation, came from Asia Minor, and, in fact, the Ægean, Scythian, Attic, Sumerian and even the ancient Egyptian civilisations were all links in one chain and were all forged on the anvil of Altay. It was beyond doubt that the Turks were a brachycephalic race, and therefore the whole Alpine stock had a Turkish origin.

4. One participant in the congress, Zeki Velidi Bey, had the courage to assert that the Gazi's theory of the universality of the Turkish race was scientifically untenable. He thereby raised a storm of protest, and was so severely attacked and ridiculed by a leading Turkish archæologist that he found that he had no option but to resign his position as professor at the Faculty of Letters in the University of Constantinople.

5. At this point it is perhaps worth recalling that, about a year ago, Fuad Küprülüzade Bey, a philologist, and especially a "Turcologist" of European reputation, and a direct descendant of the famous family of Küprülü, which provided several Grand Viziers, was, for maintaining views similarly inconsistent with the Gazi's theory, removed on a transparently manufactured pretext from his position as dean of the Constantinople Faculty of Letters and professor of the first class, and degraded to that of professor of the third class.

6. Another rather surprising outcome of the congress is the offer made by my American colleague, in a letter to the president of the congress, to have the record of the proceedings of the congress translated into English and published in the United States for distribution amongst American universities and libraries, at his own expense, subject to the approval of the congress, which was, of course, gladly given.

7. There is one comment on the motives and results of the deliberations of the congress which I venture to submit as having in it some indication of the train of thought which prompted the Gazi to delve into the nebulous past in this manner. The comment is that of a Turk, who remarked that the conception of the Gazi's theory was evidently intended to produce a cult to replace Islam by giving the Turkish nation a tradition and a heritage which would be the object of their pride and the source of their *amour-propre* in much the same way as the cult of communism had been developed among the people of Soviet Russia. The president of the congress, Yusuf Akcura Bey, stated in his closing speech that the object of the researches undertaken by the commission was to give the Turkish people their proper place in history, and while numerous foreign experts will doubtless agree that that place is being secured largely by usurpation, it is reasonable to assume that the new Turkish history, as dispensed in Turkish schools, will tend to concentrate the attention of the new generation on the racial aspect of its past to the exclusion of all extraneous aspects such as its religious antecedents. I doubt not that every opportunity will be eagerly seized to secure as wide a publicity as possible for the new notions both at home and abroad, and the presence of two members of the Historical Research Commission at the forthcoming Prehistoric and Protohistoric Congress in London has, I feel sure, been decided upon with this end in view.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

E 3830/3830/44

No. 11.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received July 28.*)

(No. 250.)

Constantinople, July 21, 1932.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to transmit to you herewith a copy of a despatch from my military attaché, giving an interesting account of conversations he has had recently with Abbas Hilmi Pasha, the ex-Khedive.

2. Abbas Hilmi is in many ways better qualified than most foreigners to know something of the real situation in inner Turkish circles, but much of what he said to Major O'Leary is more or less common knowledge, or, rather, general supposition, and on other points I should not be prepared to agree altogether with the views of his Highness.

3. For instance, Abbas Hilmi is not alone in finding the Gazi's relations with Ismet Pasha very obscure. We all of us do. My own opinion is that the two men are temperamentally different, which leads to occasional friction, but that they are united in their work for Turkey, and it will take a great deal to break that bond. As for the Gazi having lost much of his power, this is more or less guesswork. For some time there has been no occasion for the Gazi to assert his personality, but, should such an occasion arise, I should be surprised if his name were not found still to possess nearly all its old magic.

4. As regards the allusion to Afet Hanum, eldest of the Gazi's adopted daughters and a serious and responsible character, it is, I think, not so much his enemies as his boon companions who intrigue against her. She undoubtedly possesses a restraining influence over the Gazi, and is able to curtail his indulgence in all-night sittings of poker and douzico.

5. Except that I think that the ex-Khedive rather underrates Ismet Pasha, the rest of his Highness's observations in the fourth paragraph of Major O'Leary's despatch are more or less commonplaces; but I cannot agree with Abbas Hilmi's view, as expressed in the following paragraph, that Ismet Pasha was unfavourably impressed by much that he saw in Russia. My own impression is that Ismet Pasha, while alive to the obvious difficulties and weaknesses of the Soviet régime, yet considers that the two most satisfactory forms of modern Government are those of Bolshevik Russia and Fascist Italy, and seeks to apply the best points of both to the administration of Turkey.

6. Lastly, I should much doubt the Gazi being angry with Tevfik Rüştü Bey for bringing Turkey into the League of Nations. If it were true, it would go far to bear out Abbas Hilmi's view that the Gazi has lost much of his power, for certainly, until recently, there would have been no question whatever of Turkey entering the League of Nations if the Gazi had been opposed to the idea. Moreover, Turkey's entrance into the League of Nations is all in accordance with the Gazi's "westernising" efforts. From all I can learn, there is no doubt that Tevfik Rüştü suffered considerably under the strain of his recent journeys to Tehran, Moscow and Rome, and that the state of his health made it inadvisable for him to go to Geneva. Abbas Hilmi might reply that, in that case, the Government would normally have sent another Minister, such as Sükrü Kaya, who always acts as Minister for Foreign Affairs in the absence of Tevfik Rüştü. It could be replied to this by anyone who was familiar with Tevfik Rüştü Bey that, if his Excellency could not gather for himself the sweets of the official reception of Turkey into the League, he was not going to let any of his colleagues do so. But my own belief is that the explanation is much simpler, though purely conjectural. I gather that in certain quarters connected in various ways with the League of Nations the entry of Turkey has been by no means favourably regarded, especially in the case of the Armenians, and I think it quite likely that the Turkish Government, aware of this and fearing an awkward incident, and possibly an actual attempt at assassination, decided that it was better to avoid a formal *début* at Geneva.

I have, &c.

GEORGE R. CLERK.

Enclosure in No. 11.

Major O'Leary to Sir G. Clerk.

(No. 2. Confidential.)

Constantinople, July 18, 1932.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to submit to your Excellency's notice some observations by His Highness Abbas Hilmi Pasha, ex-Khedive of Egypt, with whom I have recently had several opportunities of speaking.

The ex-Khedive, who describes himself as a Turk of Kavalla, professes sympathy for the Gazi as a fellow-Rumeliot. Their friendship dates from the War in Tripoli in 1912, when Enver Pasha, already jealous of Mustafa Kemal, tried to poison him. Two years later, when Enver informed all military attachés abroad that he was about to bring Turkey into the war as Germany's ally, Kemal was the only one who found the courage to protest.

Abbas Hilmi's disapproval of the present régime in this country is based on his conviction that the Anatolian is inferior to the European Turk. He attributes the complacence with which in the last forty years they have lost all their European possessions, from Crete to Western Thrace, to a fatuous self-sufficiency, and thinks that if they were to lose Constantinople to-morrow they would pretend that it was a happy release.

He considers that the Gazi has lost much of his power, but finds his relations with Ismet Pasha very obscure. The Gazi is surrounded by a small band of devoted Turks, all of European origin, including the commander of the Angora garrison. Afet Hanum watches him very closely, and Abbas recently warned her that the Gazi's enemies were intriguing to separate her from the President. He describes Ismet as a staff officer, who knows nothing of Europe, and thinks that there are few honest men in the Government, other than Aptulhalik, who is not clever. The dangerous clique is composed of such men as Mahout Esat, Sarasoglu Sükrü and Sükrü Kaya, "des anarchistes qui ont fait leurs études à Lausanne et à Genève." Fethi Bey is also quite honest, but not very intelligent. The Gazi likes him personally, but was obliged to suppress the Liberal party hurriedly, owing to its surprising popularity.

Abbas Hilmi thinks that Ismet Pasha was unfavourably impressed by much that he saw in Russia during his recent visit, and was not deceived by the demonstrations of military and industrial prowess. Profoundly convinced that Turkey has nothing to learn from the Bolshevik régime, the Prime Minister then went to Rome to study the opposing theory of government. The members of the Turkish delegation, talking amongst themselves, were heard by a friend of the ex-Khedive to suggest that, although the army to-day is loyal, a militia on the Italian model would be a very useful safeguard.

The Gazi is supposed to have expressed his anger with the Foreign Minister for bringing Turkey into the League of Nations after his engagements with Russia to the contrary, and to have said that it was shameful, and that someone else should go to Geneva, either Sükrü Kaya or Recep Bey. Perhaps this is the explanation of Tevfik Rüştü's recent indisposition.

The ex-Khedive professes to bear no ill-will to England for any friction during his twenty-three years in Egypt. He hopes that the mandate in Palestine will continue for many years, as the Jews cannot govern, and the Arabs, like Albanians in the Ottoman Empire, are only fit to be guardians and doorkeepers.

His Highness leaves in a few days to join his brother-in-law at Bad Gastein, and will be back in Turkey at the end of November.

I have, &c.

B. J. O'LEARY,

Major, R.A.

[E 3834/449/44] No. 12.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received July 29.)

(No. 257.)

Sir, *Constantinople, July 23, 1932.*

IN my despatch No. 237 of the 12th July, I enclosed the text of a letter addressed by the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Soviet Chargé d'Affaires on the occasion of this country's entry into the League of Nations.

2. I now have the honour to transmit an extract from the "République" of the 21st instant, giving the text of a further communication from Tevfik Rüştü Bey to M. Astakhoff on the same subject. It will be observed that the new letter resembles in many respects the note sent by Dr. Stresemann to the Soviet Ambassador in Berlin on the 24th April, 1926 (not 1924, as stated by the "République"), shortly before Germany's entry into the League. Assuming that the text given by the "République" is correct, the German letter is the more cautiously worded of the two.

3. The main points of the new Turkish letter, which are two in number, may be summarised as follows:—

(i) Soviet Russia is assured that Turkey's entry into the League in no way affects her undertakings as given in the Pact of Paris of the 17th December, 1925, to the effect that the two countries shall in no circumstances take up arms against one another or join in agreements or alliances directed against either Power. The letter points out that Turkey's desire to join the League is due to her belief that this society is designed for the peaceful settlement of international disputes. Should Turkey, contrary to her expectations, observe any desire or tendency on the part of the League either to act in contradiction to pacific principles or to adopt aims hostile to the U.S.S.R., she will oppose them by all means in her power.

(ii) Soviet Russia is assured that the assumption by Turkey of the obligations laid down in articles 16 and 17 of the Covenant will have no influence upon her policy towards the U.S.S.R. In case an accusation of initiating a war of aggression be brought against the latter Power, the provisions of article 3 (? of the Covenant; the allusion is here somewhat obscure) will first have to be taken into consideration: but in any case such an accusation, "which Turkey would consider to be unjust," would not place her under an obligation to take part in coercive measures against Soviet Russia.

4. As regards the general question of participation in coercive measures, the letter refers M. Astakhoff to the relevant passage in the Turkish reply to the League invitation (of which the text was enclosed in my despatch under reference) where mention is made of the special situation in which Turkey finds herself as a result of the military clauses of the Lausanne Treaty.

5. In conclusion I would point out that the Turkish assurances to Russia appear to be based on the following large assumptions: (*a*) That a pacific policy must always be inconsistent with an anti-Russian policy; and (*b*) that Russia is incapable of committing an act of aggression against another Power. In taking her place at Geneva, Turkey thus makes considerable mental reservations in favour of her northern neighbour and her joy at becoming a member of the League is tempered by a marked anxiety lest she lose any degree of Russia's friendship. Tevfik Rüstü's letters, in a word, are an attempt on his part to eat his cake and have it.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

Enclosure in No. 12.

Extract from the "République" of July 21, 1932.

LA TURQUIE À LA SOCIÉTÉ DES NATIONS.—UNE LETTRE DE TEVFIK RUCHDI BEY AU REPRÉSENTANT DE L'U.R.S.S.

EN exposant les raisons de l'entrée de la Turquie à la Société des Nations, le Ministre des Affaires étrangères, Tevfik Ruchdi Bey, a donné lecture à la G. A. N. d'une lettre qu'il avait lui-même adressée sur le même sujet au Chargé d'Affaires soviétique à Ankara, M. Achtakof. Le Ministre avait en outre déclaré son intention d'adresser une nouvelle lettre au même représentant, dans le sens de la communication que l'Allemagne a faite au Gouvernement soviétique, en date du 24 avril 1924, c'est-à-dire un peu avant l'adhésion de ce Gouvernement à la Société des Nations.

Voici le texte de cette deuxième lettre de Tevfik Ruchdi Bey:

"M. le Chargé d'Affaires,

"Je m'estime heureux de porter à votre connaissance ce qui suit, au nom de mon Gouvernement, comme suit à ma lettre en date du 10 juillet 1932.

"L'entrée de la Turquie dans la Société des Nations ne saurait nullement porter atteinte au développement des relations d'amitié qui se sont heureusement établies entre nos deux pays, dans une période où deux États luttaient pour leur indépendance respective, relations dont la vitalité a été démontrée à chacune des phases successives de leur développement.

"L'entrée de la Turquie dans la Société des Nations ne porte et ne saurait porter aucune atteinte aux engagements contractés par le traité signé à Paris en date du 17 décembre 1925, et complété par le protocole en date du 17 décembre 1929. Le Gouvernement de la République turque s'estime heureux d'exposer ici ouvertement une fois de plus les engagements dont il s'agit

"Le Gouvernement turc est parfaitement convaincu que les engagements ci-dessus mentionnés, notamment les dispositions des articles 1er et 2 du pacte de 1925, ne pourront être préjudiciés par la participation de la Turquie à la Société des Nations. Le Gouvernement turc apprécie comme il convient la tâche de ce groupement tendant à faire résoudre les litiges internationaux par des moyens pacifiques, et il a résolu de collaborer par tous les moyens dont il dispose à sa réalisation.

"Cependant, au cas où contrairement à ses prévisions le Gouvernement turc constaterait, de la part de cette Société, à n'importe quel moment, des velléités ou tendances contraires à ce principe de paix, ou bien des visées contre l'Union des Républiques soviétiques, il s'y opposera de toute sa force et avec la plus grande énergie.

"2. Le respect par la Turquie des engagements contractés conformément aux articles 16 et 17 de la Société des Nations ne saurait altérer la politique à l'égard de l'Union des Républiques soviétiques. Ces articles traitent du cas de guerre déclaré par l'Union des Républiques soviétiques et nécessitant l'intervention de la Société.

"Dans le cas d'une accusation semblable, il y aurait lieu de prendre en considération les dispositions de l'article 3. En tout état de cause, une accusation de ce genre, portée par les autres États contre l'Union des Républiques soviétiques, accusation que la Turquie considérerait comme injuste, elle ne saurait obliger, aux termes de l'article 16, la Turquie à participer aux mesures de coercition contre les Soviets.

"Quant à la question de savoir quels sont les cas qui nécessiteront, en général, la participation ou la non-participation de la Turquie aux mesures de coercition dont il s'agit, ainsi que de la mesure de sa participation dans le cas affirmatif, la Turquie s'en rapporte, à ce sujet, aux clauses relatives à cette même question, formulées dans sa réponse, en date du 9 juillet, à la lettre d'invitation qu'elle a reçue de la Société des Nations.

"Je vous prie, &c.

"TEVFIK RUCHDI."

[E 3805/2617/44] No. 13.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received July 28.)

(No. 258.)

Sir, *Constantinople, July 24, 1932.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 228 of the 5th instant, I have the honour to report that an Italian naval squadron consisting of the cruiser "Quarto," flying the flag of Admiral Moreno, and four destroyers, "Cairoli," "La Farina," "Bassini," and "Cosenz," after passing up the Bosphorus on the 8th instant *en route* for Varna, returned to Constantinople to make an official visit on the morning of the 16th, and left on the 23rd for Brindisi after a successful stay of one week.

2. The programme of this visit presented the usual features, the only novelty being a visit by the admiral on the 18th to Yalova in the Gulf of Ismid, where he paid his respects to the Gazi, who recently left Angora for this summer resort.

3. On the arrival of the squadron off the Palace of Dolmabahçe on the 16th, the usual salutes were exchanged. The Captain of the Port, the Italian consul-general and vice-consul and the Italian naval attaché went aboard to call on the admiral in the morning. In the afternoon the admiral was taken by the naval attaché to call on the Italian Ambassador at Therapia, and in the evening he visited the Apostolic Delegate, who celebrated Mass on board the flagship on the following morning, a Sunday. The morning of the 17th was occupied by official calls and in the afternoon a garden party was given by the Italian Ambassador at the Palazzo Venezia (the Italian Embassy in Pera) in honour of the admiral and the officers of the squadron.

4. The 18th, prior to the admiral's departure for Yalova, was devoted to an official reception in the flagship of the leading Turkish officials and of other prominent personalities including the chief members of the local athletic clubs.

5. On the morning of the 19th the admiral led a detachment from the ships under his command through the streets of Pera to the Taxim Square, where he laid a wreath on the monument to the republic. In the afternoon he received the foreign naval attachés on board. In the evening he attended, with his officers, a ball given in their honour by the Italian Ambassador at the Therapia Embassy.

6. The 20th was a day of comparative inactivity, a detachment of officers merely returning the visit of the athletic clubs.

7. On the 21st the admiral was entertained by the local Fascio at the Casa d'Italia. Appropriate speeches were exchanged, followed by what the press described as a "vermouth d'honneur." Further vermouths awaited the admiral on the morning of the 22nd, at a reception which he attended of the "Società Operaia," the local guild of working-class Italians.

8. That afternoon, in the circumstances reported in my despatch No. 253 of the 21st July, the destroyer "Cosenz," with the Italian Ambassador on board, left the squadron for Italy, the "Quarto" firing a salute on his departure. The remainder of the squadron sailed at dawn on the 23rd for Brindisi.

9. Since writing the above, Captain Macdonald, Straits Commission, has drawn my attention to the striking fact that there appears, during the whole visit of the Italian squadron, to have been no exchange whatever of the usual civilities and hospitality with the Turkish naval authorities, that no Turkish naval officers were present at any of the receptions I have recorded, and that the customary visit to the Turkish naval school at Halki was omitted from the programme altogether.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

P.S.—I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Rome.

G. R. C.

[E 4066/449/44] No. 14.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received August 12.)

(No. 266.)

Sir, *Constantinople, August 1, 1932.*

WITH reference to your confidential despatch No. 270 of the 8th July, regarding alleged negotiations between the Turkish and Soviet Governments on the subject of the Dardanelles, I have the honour to inform you that the British delegate to the Straits Commission informs me that his Greek and Roumanian colleagues recently enquired of him whether he had any information about this matter, as they had had their attention drawn to notices in their own press.

2. Captain Macdonald took an opportunity of raising the question with Vassif Pasha, his Turkish colleague, who is usually frank with him, and who assured him on this occasion that there was no truth in the suggestion that the Soviet Government was pressing the Turkish Government to raise the question of the abolition of the international control of the straits, or, alternatively, to demand a revision of the Straits Convention. The Turkish delegate, moreover, gave Captain Macdonald to understand that Tevfik Rüştü Bey was in favour of the retention of the Straits Commission.

3. I am not at present able to add anything to the above observations. I shall bear the matter in mind, and I shall take whatever opportunity I may find of obtaining confirmation (or otherwise) of the impression left upon Captain Macdonald by Vassif Pasha.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

E 4599/3822/44 No. 15.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received September 9.)

(No. 299.)

Sir, *Constantinople, August 29, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to report that, according to an announcement in the press, confirmed to me by one of the more literary of the Gazi's associates, a Turkish Linguistic Congress is shortly to be opened at Constantinople. I gather that the origin of this congress is as follows:—

2. My despatch No. 249 of the 21st July last described a movement, inspired by the Gazi and enthusiastically followed by practically the whole of the Turkish *intelligentsia*, for the identification of the Turkish race with all the illustrious peoples of history, and the consequent attribution to primæval Turkish culture of all credit for the great civilisations of the past and present. It only remained to confirm these conclusions, if any confirmation were necessary, by a corresponding discovery in the linguistic sphere, and it may be said that, thanks to the universality of the presidential genius, this discovery has already virtually been made, and the congress is to set its seal upon the theory.

3. It may be remembered that as long ago as the spring of last year (see paragraph 5 of my despatch No. 147 of the 29th April, 1931), the Gazi's etymological researches had led him to the significant conclusion that Kent, Tashkent and Samarkand had a common origin in the Turkish tongue, and that the Uz tribe of the Black Sea coasts had given their name to the various English Ouses. (Incidentally, "uz" has the meaning of "kind" or "gentle" in Turkish, and, even apart from the Black Sea tribe, these epithets are strikingly characteristic of the principal English river of that name.) The Gazi's leisure hours have increased since then, for he tends to all appearance to leave current affairs more and more in the hands of his Ministers, and there is neither scope nor money for any more sensational reforms. His Excellency's philological studies have benefited from the lack of more spectacular occupation, and now for the first time the world at large, through the medium of the Turkish press, has been vouchsafed a glimpse of the accumulating treasure which is to be revealed in due course. Yunus Nadi Bey, the Gazi's faithful journalistic henchman, has just published in the "République" a series of articles, written after a private interview with the Great Guide, which gave clear promise of what is to come, and it will be no mere hypothesis, but an established fact, that will confront the literary world.

4. As the ancient Turkish culture is the mother of European civilisation, even so the ancient Turkish language is the mother of all European tongues. Such is the Gazi's coming discovery, which Yunus Nadi has been forestalling with pæans of reverential joy. No positive proof is available for the present, but so attractive a theory (as it is still allowed to be) has little need of proof, and the Gazi's historical and ethnological conclusions needed none to acquire an authority which no Turk would dare to question in public, and very few in private. Short of absolute proof, however, Yunus Nadi Bey cites for his readers a number of verbal derivations which have forced themselves upon the Gazi during his study of a dictionary of the Chagatai dialect of Turkish, published at Constantinople by one Sheikh Suleiman Efendi Buhari in 1298 A.H. (1882 A.D.). The first example quoted is nothing short of sensational. The real origin of the European word "culture," which English dictionaries have been content to derive from the Latin verb "colere," is now plain. The Chagatai dictionary contains a word "kiltourmak," meaning "to bring, prepare, make to succeed, cause, conduct, replace, fix." Take away the infinitival termination "mak," says the Gazi, and what do you find? "Kiltour"—"Culture." What is culture but a compendium of the meanings given above? Yunus Nadi, inspired by this example of the simple science of philology, has made similar discoveries for himself, as, for instance, the word "taosmak," with its significations "to be joyous and enthusiastic, to drink in honour of someone." Remove the "mak" as before and what is left? "Taos"—"Toast." Thus another word of general European usage and unexceptionable modernity proves to be of Turkish origin. Another brilliant discovery is the origin of "pyjama." Hitherto supposed to be Persian, this word, with its even more markedly European and modern implications, should no longer be considered Persian except in so far as the Persians borrowed it from the ancient Turks. Does not py = bi = bey, and as incontestably, jama = djame = giyme? Bey-giyme, the dress of the Bey. (Anyhow, a more dignified explanation than the obvious one of "foot of the garment," which is a literal translation of the perfectly straightforward Persian.)

5. But all this has its serious side, quite apart from the solemn convictions of the Gazi and his mouthpiece. In paragraph 6 of my despatch No. 249 I reported that my American colleague had offered to have the proceedings of the recent Turkish Historical Congress translated into English and published in the United States, at his own expense, for distribution amongst American universities and libraries. The counsellor of the United States Embassy has informed a member of my staff that this report, which was broadcast by the Turkish press, was not altogether correct. What Mr. Sherrill really offered to have translated and published at his expense is a still non-existent summary of the four volumes of the Turkish Historical Research Commission's official history, which has been imposed on all teaching bodies in this country. At all events, the dangers to be apprehended from the broadcasting in the English language of such theories, whether historical or linguistic, are perhaps more real than would appear at first sight. It is not to be supposed that they will be received with anything less than amused contempt by even the less illustrious academic institutions of the New World; while in Europe, and particularly in England, it is not difficult to imagine learned societies exploding with laughter over the Gazi's extravaganzas, and learned professors writing to the "Times" to poke fun at some statement or deduction that appears to them irresistibly comic. Such otherwise harmless incidents might be counted on to kindle a blaze of official Turkish indignation which Yunus Nadi and scribes of his kidney would eagerly fan into a nation-wide conflagration. Xenophobia is happily fairly quiescent at present, but there are from time to time indications that it is ready to flare up on the smallest pretext, and none would be so effective as a foreign reflexion on the Gazi or slight on the national pride.

6. I share the view which has been expressed by one of the very few genuine Turkish intellectuals to a member of my staff, that it is both surprising and regrettable that the President of the Republic should have allowed himself to become obsessed by his present mania to the total neglect of the pressing financial and economic problems with which the country is confronted.

I have, &c.

GEORGE R. CLERK.

[**E 4843/4841/44**] No. 16.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received September* 22.)

(No. 310.)

Sir, *Constantinople, September* 18, 1932.

WITH reference to your despatch No. 352 of the 5th instant, I have the honour to report that His Majesty's ships "Curaçoa" (flying the flag of Rear-Admiral Tottenham, C.B.E.), "Colombo," "Curlew," "Ceres" and "Rover," arrived off Constantinople at 7 A.M. on the 16th September and saluted the Turkish flag.

2. Accompanied by His Majesty's consul-general, the rear-admiral called on the Vali of Constantinople and afterwards paid a visit with my military attaché to Major-General Rüştü Pasha, who received his call on behalf of Lieutenant-General Şükrü Naili Pasha, General Officer Commanding the IIIrd Army Corps, who was absent on manœuvres. Later the rear-admiral proceeded to Dolmabahçe Palace to write his name in the visitors' book of the President of the Republic. On returning to the flag ship the rear-admiral received the calls of the Vali and of Major-General Rüştü Pasha, and later in the day was visited by the aide-de-camp of the Gazi. In view of the shortness of the squadron's stay, and of the time taken by the official visits to and from the Turkish authorities, I arranged with the rear-admiral that formal visits between us should be dispensed with, and that I should visit him unofficially after a luncheon party which I gave in his honour, and to which were invited members of his staff, the commanding officers of the ships under his command, and leading Turkish civil, military and naval authorities.

3. As I reported in my despatch No. 228 of the 5th July, the suggestion that His Majesty's ships should pay a call at Constantinople on their way to the Black Sea was warmly welcomed by the Turkish authorities, and the visit has given them satisfaction. Officers and men who landed to visit the town or accepted local hospitality were everywhere received in friendly fashion though without demonstrativeness. Their visit to the war-graves on the Gallipoli peninsula on the 15th instant was accomplished without incident in the conditions laid down by the Turkish authorities, namely, that officers should land in mufti and men in uniform, and that the visit should terminate before nightfall.

4. A matter which necessitated calling for some explanation from the Turkish authorities arose in connexion with the salute fired by His Majesty's ship "Curaçoa" on arrival off the city. Although His Majesty's ship "Curaçoa" saluted the Turkish flag with twenty-one guns, the Turkish gunners firing from the Selimiye barracks only replied with eleven. I was satisfied, after hearing the statements of the Vali of Constantinople and of Major-General Rüştü Pasha on the subject, that the Turkish gunners who had been instructed to return gun for gun had only heard eleven guns fired from the British flag-ship, the other ten which were fired on the lee side being inaudible owing to the distance and the direction of a rather strong wind. I represented, however, to the Turkish authorities that their omission should, if possible, be rectified, and we agreed that on the departure of the squadron for the Black Sea, about 5 P.M., the flag-ship should fire a salute of twenty-one guns in honour of the President of the Republic, who was in residence at Dolmabahce Palace on the Bosphorus, and that the salute should be returned from Selimiye barracks. This was accordingly done, no mistake being on this occasion made by the Turks, and, in view of this, I am of opinion that the matter may be considered satisfactorily closed.

I have, &c.

GEORGE R. CLERK.

[**E 4844/70/44**] No. 17.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received September* 22.)

(No. 311.)

Sir, *Constantinople, September* 18, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to report that about two weeks ago it began to be rumoured that the Minister of National Economy, Mustafa Seref Bey, was about to resign for reasons of health, and that his successor would be Celal Bey,

the Director-General of the "Iş Bankası." This rumour was soon confirmed by an announcement in the press of the 8th September, which added that the new Minister had left Constantinople for Angora with Ismet Pasha on the previous evening.

2. Celal Bey is one of the numerous Deputies for Smyrna, and was chief cashier in the Brusa branch of the Deutsche Orient Bank before the War of Independence, in the course of which he joined the Nationalist forces and is believed to have served with distinction. In 1923 he was appointed Minister of National Economy—a much less important post then than now—in the Angora Government, and during his tenure of office acted for the Minister for Foreign Affairs in the latter's absence. He soon afterwards became Minister of Exchange, Reconstruction and Settlement (*i.e.*, of the Moslem refugees from outside Turkey), a post which he retained until July 1924, when he was appointed Director-General of the newly-established "Iş Bankası" on the recommendation of the Gazi himself.

3. The member of my staff at present resident in Angora has learned from a reliable source that the causes underlying Mustafa Şeref's resignation (which he was undoubtedly called upon to tender), and Celal Bey's appointment to a post which has become of critical importance, are as follows: Finding the business of the "Iş Bankası" greatly hampered by the Government's exaggerated policy of State control of trade and industry, Celal Bey summoned his friends who were in like position and agreed to be their mouthpiece in pleading with the Gazi the cause of private enterprise *versus* State control. The President listened sympathetically, the Prime Minister less so, but Ismet Pasha eventually agreed to let Celal Bey put his ideas to the test by himself taking over the portfolio of National Economy. It is not expected, Mr. Montgomery was informed, that the new Minister will attempt to reverse the Government's economic policy completely, and it is thought that he will be content to modify some of the more unreasonable of the recent quota decrees regarding which the commercial secretary to His Majesty's Embassy has reported fully in the Overseas Trade (B) series.

4. However that may be, there is no doubt that the eclipse of that obstinate and doctrinaire economist Mustafa Şeref and the advent to power of a practical and experienced business man in the person of Celal Bey, has caused an outburst of satisfaction in the local industrial and commercial world, now eagerly awaiting the result of a full Cabinet Council which was originally announced for the 11th of this month, but which, though all the Ministers had flocked to Angora to attend it, was postponed until to-day, presumably in order to enable the new Minister to become familiar with all the aspects of the economic situation, and to hear and consider the views of the various deputations which have been hastening to the capital.

5. The fact that Ismet Pasha travelled by air from Angora to Constantinople on the 16th September, to confer for a few hours with the President of the Republic before returning by air to Angora, is generally connected with to-day's meeting of the Cabinet, and enhances its importance. There is little doubt that radical measures are needed to improve the economic situation, and I hear that the financial situation is such that Government employees in the Eastern Anatolian districts have been unable to receive pay for two months, and are beginning to react vigorously in consequence.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 5141/34/44] No. 18.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received October 7.)

(No. 317.)

Sir, *Constantinople, September 29, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to report that Dr. Reşit Galip Bey has been appointed Minister of Education in place of Esat Bey, who has resigned. A biography of the new Minister will be found in my despatch No. 21 of the 14th January, 1932, on Turkish personalities, and a further reference to him is made in the enclosure in my despatch No. 369 of the 24th September, 1930.

2. Reşit Galip Bey's appointment will strengthen the Cabinet. The resignation of his predecessor, following so closely on that of Mustafa Şeref Bey,

Minister of National Economy (see my despatch No. 311 of the 18th September, 1932), gave rise to rumours that other Ministers would also be changed. It was hinted that Ismet Pasha might be replaced by Recep Bey, secretary-general of the Popular party, that Tevfik Rüştü Bey would be appointed to Moscow, and that Şükrü Kaya Bey would resign. In face of these rumours, the Government found it necessary to publish a *démenti* that any further ministerial changes were impending or contemplated.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 5145/34/44] No. 19.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received October 7.)

(No. 326.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October 1, 1932.*

IN my despatch No. 311 of the 18th September and No. 317 of the 29th September last I briefly recorded the changes of occupancy of the portfolios of National Economy and Public Instruction. It may be of interest to supplement those despatches by a short comment on the possible reasons for the changes.

2. Mustafa Şeref Bey, the late Minister of National Economy, was, as I found when negotiating our commercial treaty, though honest enough, a narrow-minded and pedantic doctrinaire who thought it necessary on every occasion to show his profound knowledge of his subject by disagreeing with every proposal put before him, regardless of its merits. This attitude may have its uses in reducing foreign negotiators to a state of imbecile and pliable exasperation, but when applied to the practical work of Turkish domestic economy is likely to lead to hopeless confusion. It was, therefore, clearly only a question of time before the situation created by Mustafa Şeref would become so impossible that some drastic change of policy would have to be made, but a more serious question was how much, and how irreparable, would be the injury done to Turkey's economic life before he gave way to a more practically-minded successor. Ismet Pasha has a natural loyalty to his colleagues, especially to those chosen by himself, and there exists in him a streak of obstinacy which leads him to keep them in office, even when their unfitness is generally recognised. In the case of Mustafa Şeref, the growing irritation of the Turkish business world at the flood of restrictive, contradictory, unintelligible, and unworkable legislation reached such a pitch that the head of the Iş Bankasi, finding all other means useless, went direct to the Gazi. The latter realised that Celal Bey's complaints were well-founded and seems to have pressed Ismet Pasha, who was present at the interview, so firmly that the Prime Minister, with much reluctance, gave way, and agreed that Mustafa Şeref should go and his place be taken by Celal Bey, who could thus apply the remedies he had so forcibly urged.

3. I have been told that, before he yielded, Ismet Pasha took very vehemently the line that Mustafa Şeref's actions were not individual, but measures on which the Government had agreed as a whole, and for which it was responsible as a whole, and that it would stand or fall by the Minister of National Economy. If this is true, what, in my belief, turned the scale and averted an open conflict between the Gazi and the Prime Minister were two more or less chance events, which had already brought forcibly home to Ismet Pasha the disastrous trend of Mustafa Şeref's policy. The first factor was that the Prime Minister happened recently to have paid an official visit to Smyrna for some ceremony or other, and the change from the rarefied optimism of Angora to the justified depression of Turkey's Liverpool came as a great but salutary shock. There is no doubt that the deplorable condition of the Turkish business community in Smyrna made a very deep impression.

4. The other event was brought about fortuitously by me. I happened to be sailing my small yacht one afternoon in the Marmora when Ismet Pasha was crossing in his launch from the mainland to spend a few days on one of the Prince's Islands. On seeing my yacht he came alongside to pay me a visit. There was on board a friend of mine, the leading British resident in Turkey, and the man best qualified to express views on Turkey's economic situation. I set my two guests to talk and Ismet learnt a great deal that I am sure he had never heard before—amongst other things, that one of Mustafa Şeref's most ingenious

devices for balancing imports and exports had merely added another 25 or 30 per cent. to the cost of Turkey's imports. The exporter was obliged to obtain a "permis d'exportation" before he could ship his goods, the idea being that in this way the amount of imports that could be allowed would be effectively controlled. But the practical result was very different. Importers simply went to friendly exporters and bought "permis d'exportation" at a premium of 25 or 30 per cent., with which certificate they proceeded to import their goods. It is interesting that the first act of the new Minister of National Economy was to abolish the "permis d'exportation."

5. The result has been that Ismet Pasha abandoned Mustafa Seref and that Celal Bey is at this moment one of the most overworked men in the world. It is worth noting that this is the first time Turkish public opinion has forced its will upon the Turkish Government.

6. The change in the Ministry of Public Instruction is a less serious and more personal matter. In my despatch No. 301 of the 4th September, I have referred to the Gazi's latest craze for reform of the Turkish language, which, like his reform of the alphabet, has been met, if not with active obstruction, at any rate with little enthusiasm by the educated classes. This is not surprising, for it is somewhat as though His Majesty's Government decided that pure English was only spoken by the Norfolk labourer and that in future that particular dialect should alone be employed in all official work. Even those who feared the great man's frown, and were therefore prepared to assist in the reform, probably urged that it could only be developed gradually. Such advice is no good to the Gazi, who, once he has decided that a change or a reform must be made, holds that it cannot be made too quickly, and I have no doubt that it is for this reason that the young, ambitious, energetic and capable Resit Galip has been made Minister of Public Instruction.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

E 5286/1133/25 No. 20.

Sir John Simon to Sir G. Clerk (Angora).

(No. 395.)

Sir, *Foreign Office, October* 10, 1932.

THE Turkish Ambassador having expressed a wish to see me, called this afternoon. He stated that it would no doubt be within my recollection that his predecessor, Ferit Bey, had raised early this year the desirability of our Governments exchanging any information of common interest about the Hejaz-Nejd which might reach either Government. (This proposal was recorded in my despatch No. 82 of the 1st March to Mr. Morgan.)

2. Munir Bey was accordingly authorised to inform me that the Emir Feisal of the Hejaz-Nejd, when he visited Angora in June last, had placed an order for 100 rifles of Turkish make and two mitrailleuses, which were to be delivered to his father, King Abdul Aziz (Ibn Saud), by two Turkish officers, who were about to proceed to the Hejaz to inspect and repair some old cannons dating from the time when the Imperial Ottoman Government ruled over the Hejaz. In reply to an enquiry on my part, whether there was any question of the supply of ammunition, his Excellency replied in the negative.

3. Munir Bey then said that on the 9th May last a Turk, called Mesout, whose name appears on the list of 150 people whose entry into Turkey is forbidden, had made opprobrious remarks about the Ghazi in one of the restaurants at Nicosia in Cyprus. Representations which had been made by the Turkish consul to the local authorities had met with no success. His Excellency therefore appealed to me to take such steps as might be possible. I explained to him the inherent difficulties in a case of this nature, and added that if he would supply my department with further details, the matter would be considered; but I held out little or no hope of being able to give his Government satisfaction in this particular matter.

I am, &c.
JOHN SIMON.

[E 5494/3822/44] No. 21.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received October 21.)

(No. 334.)

Sir, *Constantinople, October* 13, 1932.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 301 of the 4th September last, I have the honour to report that the first Turkish Linguistic Congress was opened at Dolmabahçe Palace on the 26th September, a date which is, in consequence, to be observed annually as a public holiday. The congress has been generally referred to as the "Kurultay," an old Central Asiatic word for "assembly," which was originally revived to designate the annual general meetings of the recently suppressed Türk Ojak organisation, and which has now received a new lease of life under the highest auspices.

2. The President of the Republic was present not only at the inauguration, but also at each succeeding session of the Kurultay, a fact which doubtless indicated both his keen interest in the language reform movement which he had initiated, and his determination that it should develop along the lines which he himself had laid down in advance.

3. The opening session in the great hall of the palace was attended by a large number of people, including members of the Government, Deputies, officials of all categories, university professors, schoolteachers and members of the general public. The Diplomatic Corps was not invited, but a few of its members were present, prominent among them being the Soviet Ambassador, and were accorded places of honour. Parties of peasants brought from remote districts of Turkey, and thereby considered to be repositories of primitive Turkish, pure and undefiled, were exhibited and "lionised," and wide publicity was given to their contributions to knowledge, composed in the main of praise of the Gazi, an Arabic title for which they had no Turkish equivalent.

4. After a perfervid harangue by Samih Rifat Bey, Deputy for Çanakkale, in which adulation of the Gazi was mingled with denunciation of the contemptuous attitude of the Ottoman Sultans and their parasites towards everything Turkish and the Turkish language in particular, Kâzim Pasha, President of the Grand National Assembly, was elected by acclamation president of the congress and Samih Rifat and Resit Galip Beys vice-presidents. The last mentioned, the new Minister of Public Instruction (see paragraph 6 of my despatch No. 326 of the 1st October), thereupon assured the congress that the Government were prepared to take all necessary measures for the enforcement of its recommendations, after which Samih Rifat held forth for three whole hours on the subject of the alleged resemblances between Turkish roots and foreign words "of the same family."

5. On the second day, which revealed a marked decline in public interest, the congress settled down to serious business, and was treated by successive orators to a series of discourses in which each vied with the other in fulsome adulation of the ever-present Gazi before treating, with much less enthusiasm and knowledge, of the relationship of Turkish to the Indo-European tongues on the one hand and the language of the Sumerians on the other. One eloquent speaker had discovered remarkable analogies between certain Turkish words and their Etruscan equivalents, while another easily demonstrated that the Sumerians could not possibly have been the sole creators of their grandiose civilisation, which must therefore have been the fruit of a still older culture, *i.e.*, the Turkish civilisation of 6,000 or 7,000 years ago.

6. The "star turn" of the congress made his first appearance on this occasion in the person of a mysterious Armenian professor from Sofia named Agop Martayan. He arrived some days before the opening, and was received with marked respect by various eminent personages connected with the congress, and even by the Gazi himself. His contribution to the proceedings began with an admission that the investigations into the origin of Turkish undertaken hitherto had not yielded the desired results. This was due to the fact that the historico-linguistic method had been followed, whereas, since it was a question of proto-historical relationships, the ontologico—or rather palæontologico—linguistic method was indispensable. This method would reveal the fact that Turkish was a member of the Alpine family of languages. Moreover, all the peculiarities of Turkish were to be found in the language of the Sumerians, and the name of the god Turgu, which meant "strength," was but "Turk" in a slightly different

form. In view of all this it is scarcely surprising that Professor Martayan, who, as a "fugitive" Armenian, could normally never have returned to this country, should have had his passport visé in virtue of special instructions to the Turkish Legation in Sofia.

7. According to the speakers who addressed the Kurultay on the 28th September, archæology teaches that "Turkism" was the origin of world civilisation, and that Turkish is the mother-tongue of all the Aryan languages. The languages of the Hittites, Sumerians, Medes, Hindus, Hellenes and Egyptians were derived from a single idiom, that originally spoken in Central Asia, *i.e.*, primitive Turkish. Thousands of years before the Christian era the Turk dominated all civilised countries. The honour of having invented all systems of writing, particularly the Phœnician, Hittite, Sumerian, Cyprian and Cretan, belongs to the glorious Turkish race. The so-called Indo-European languages should be known as Turco-European, and the Eastern Mediterranean should henceforth be called the Turkish Sea, a suggestion which evoked thunderous applause.

8. The congress would have pursued the even tenor of its way to the very end, on the above lines, but for Hüseyin Cahit (Jahid) Bey, formerly editor of the long-since suppressed "Tanin," and one of the very few literary Turks with more than a national reputation, who some seven years ago was condemned to perpetual exile in the interior (but subsequently released) for giving vent in his paper to a mild protest against the forcible closing down of the Opposition party organisations. During the sixth session of the Kurultay, Hüseyin Cahit threw a bombshell into the assembly by calmly stating that it would be a grave error to base conclusions on linguistic analogies which were merely apparent. The study of Turkish etymology should be entrusted, he declared, to a commission composed exclusively of *savants*. It was quite legitimate to banish from the Turkish language Arabic and Persian constructions and grammatical rules, and much progress in this domain had already been effected naturally and without recourse to artificial intervention. But the case was different as regards foreign words which had become incorporated into Turkish. Foreign words were introduced into a language for reasons of historical necessity, and in no way altered its personal character. In linguistic matters it was not a question of human will, but of gradual evolution. Moreover, in no civilised country were the written and spoken languages identical.

9. The newspapers carefully suppressed all mention of the fact that these heresies were greeted with loud applause by a considerable section of the audience, but no one ventured publicly to take Hüseyin Cahit's part. His plea for gradual evolution and simplification of the language was met at once with the retort: "We are revolutionists, not evolutionists!" and was immediately identified with "reaction." Speaker after speaker then rose to confute him, summoning Cicero, Luther, Leibnitz, Frederic the Great, Peter the Great and Catherine II to their assistance. The Gazi is understood to have been seriously annoyed and perturbed by the offending speech and still more by the applause which greeted it. His Excellency undoubtedly saw in the incident the re-emergence of one of the many heads of the Opposition hydra. The inevitable consequence of this will be that his latest reform, which is nothing less than the complete purification of Turkish from all foreign, or at least Arabic and Persian, influence, will be imposed with even greater speed and ruthlessness than would otherwise have been the case.

10. At the ninth and last meeting of the congress, held on the 6th October, the "Association for the Study of the Turkish Language," founded under the presidency of the Gazi a short time previously, was endowed with statutes consisting of nineteen articles, the last of which lays down that the "Kurultay of the Turkish Language" is to meet every two years on the date and at the place approved by the Central Council. The members of this body were then chosen, Samih Rifat Bey, Deputy for Çanakkale, and Ruşen Eşref Bey, Deputy for Afyon-Karahisar, being unanimously elected president and secretary-general respectively.

11. Since the closing of the congress, the Minister of Education has been paying a round of visits to the Stambul University, to the local headquarters of the "Halk Evi" (the Popular party's substitute for the too independent "Türk Ojak" organisation), and to other educational institutions of the former capital, impressing upon them all the importance of the linguistic reform, and incidentally

assuring the university professors that the rumours regarding their impending wholesale dismissal were unfounded. They must, however, be prepared to play a prominent part in the work of reform, and take their proper share in the labour of creating a Turkish language and culture worthy of the glories of the race. From 12,000 to 15,000 schoolmasters, says the press, are being commissioned by the Minister to search out, from the popular speech of their respective districts, from 70,000 to 90,000 "new" words, so that the Turkish language may be effectively, as it already is potentially, the richest in the world. A period of six months has been mentioned as all that is required for the fulfilment of this task, although a Turkish Deputy, closely connected with the movement, has been assuring interested foreigners that neither he nor his children, but only his children's children, will witness the complete achievement. Of this I am not so sure, for the Gazi is not content with working for posterity, and is accustomed to see his reforms in full operation within a shorter time than even his most sanguine followers could anticipate.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 5774/5774/89] No. 22

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received November 3.)

(No. 347.)

Sir, *Angora, October* 29, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to report that on the 27th instant the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs and the French Ambassador signed a protocol regarding Turkish properties in Syria, and a provisional agreement regarding the section of the Bagdad Railway which adjoins or passes through Syria. The details of these agreements have been promised to me by my French colleague and will be forwarded as soon as I receive them.

2. Negotiations leading up to the signature have been spread over a very long period and have rarely run smoothly. Frequent outbursts in the press of both countries, of which I have recorded an outstanding instance in my despatch No. 200 of the 9th June, 1932, combined with periods of anti-French feeling on the part of influential Turks, have frequently suspended or slowed up progress. The fact that a conclusion has now been reached, which is locally attributed in great measure to the advent to power of M. Herriot, but, in fact, is mostly due to the patience and tact of Count de Chambrun, the French Ambassador, shows that Turco-French relations are for the moment cordial. I am doubtful whether this cordiality will prevent Turkish statesmen from expressing the hope that Syria will soon be independent, and from encouraging Syrian Nationalist aspirations, but it will be helpful in a larger sphere and may be useful in hastening the conclusion of an agreement about the Ottoman public debt. In this connexion, Tevfik Rüştü Bey, in conversation with a member of my staff, said that no differences now existed between France and Turkey except the question of the debt, and that he hoped to hear that this had been finally settled before, or at least during, next year, which seems to indicate that negotiations may yet continue for some time.

3. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador in Paris.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 5777/33/34] No. 23.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received November 3.)

(No. 350.)

Sir, *Angora, October* 29, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to report that the Persian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mirza Mohammed Ali Khan Feroughi, arrived in Constantinople by Simplon-Orient Express on the 26th October, and left the same day for Angora, where he will stay until the 2nd November. During his stay he will be the guest of the

Turkish Government, and will assist at the ceremonies given in connexion with the anniversary of the proclamation of the Turkish Republic.

2. Feroughi Khan is accompanied by Abbas Guli Khan Garib, Musa Khan Isfendiyari, Hasan Khan Kayat, ex-Under-Secretary of State at the Persian Ministry of Economy, Gulam Riza Khan, head of the Eastern Department of the Persian Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and Colonels Muhsin Khan and Mehmet Khan Diba.

3. At Constantinople Feroughi Khan informed the representative of the "Hakimiyeti Milliye" that the purpose of his visit to Turkey was to return the visit paid to Tehran in January of this year by Tevfik Rüştü Bey. He added that all questions of major importance between the two countries had been settled. Conversations would take place about economic matters and about a projected commercial treaty. He also hoped to renew a Treaty of Neutrality, Non-Aggression, and Collaboration. Falih Rifki Bey, in a leader in the "Hakimiyeti Milliye" welcoming Feroughi Khan, attributes the improvement in the relations between Turkey and Persia to the establishment of a new régime in each country. Republican Turkey adopted the policy of peace and friendship with neighbouring States, and Feroughi Khan, who as Ambassador at Angora had been able to convince himself of the sincerity of Turkey's policy, had played his part in explaining Turkey's aims to his Shah and in bringing the countries together.

4. It is an interesting commentary on Persian mentality, as revealed by Mr. Hoare's despatches, to note that, in the course of an interview given to the "République" by Feroughi Khan, at which the Persian Ambassador was present, the latter interrupted an historical retrospect of the quarrels between the two countries, alleged to be due to the sinister influence exercised by Sultans and Shahs, to call all to witness that foreign countries especially had profited by these quarrels, and to declare that in future the friendship existing between the two sister nations, each of which had won its national independence, would be proof against every external assault.

5. At a banquet given in honour of Feroughi Khan on the 27th October, cordial speeches were made by him and by Tevfik Rüştü Bey, attributing Turco-Persian friendship to the bonds of mutual interest and to the efforts of the rulers of the countries who brought about the Treaty of Neutrality and Friendship of the 22nd April, 1926, which opened a new era in Turco-Persian relations fruitful in agreements and understandings.

6. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister at Tehran.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 6029/33/34] No. 24.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received November 18.)

(No. 352.)

Sir, *Angora, October 31, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to report that in the course of an interview with the Minister for Foreign Affairs this afternoon, his Excellency gave me a breif summary of the discussions which he intended to open with Feroughi Khan as soon as the festivities with which his Highness's visit is at present being celebrated have come to an end. I gather both from the Minister for Foreign Affairs and from Feroughi Khan himself that the business to be transacted amounts to very little, and is more designed to provide some pabulum for public opinion in both countries than to fulfil any urgent political need.

2. The Treaty of Friendship and Security of the 22nd April, 1926, will be renewed, though, if I understood Tevfik Rüstü rightly, article 1, recording inviolable peace and lasting friendship, will be taken out and recorded in a fresh and perpetual treaty. The two statesmen will also make a general survey of the relations of Persia with all her neighbours, especially with Russia, where Turkey's close friendship with Moscow may prove useful to Persia. The Minister for Foreign Affairs was possibly too polite to say so, but I have no doubt that he will be very fully informed of Mr. Hoare's negotiations with the

Persian Government. I might note in this connexion that Feroughi Khan, though as friendly and amiable as in the days when he was my colleague here, steered our conversation hastily into another direction whenever it looked like touching on the present relations between Great Britain and Persia.

3. Tevfik Rüştü Bey further said that an extradition treaty might possibly also be negotiated.

4. I have dealt in another despatch with the most important question to be discussed by Tevfik Rüştü Bey and Feroughi Khan, namely, the relations between Turkey, Persia and Iraq.

5. I have sent a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister at Tehran.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 6030/6030/65] No. 25.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received November 18.)

(No. 353.)

Sir, *Angora, October 31, 1932.*

AT the end of a memorandum of the 26th September last by Mr. Hall, of the Colonial Office, enclosed in a semi-official letter from Mr. Rendel to me of the 12th instant, it is stated that Nuri Pasha understood that the Turkish Foreign Minister intended to seek an interview with you to investigate the possibility of some sort of Security Pact, the precise nature of which Nuri Pasha was unable to explain.

2. I am unaware whether Tevfik Rüştü Bey ever carried out his intention, but when he was explaining to me this afternoon the discussions which he intended to have with Feroughi Khan, he said that one of the points was a possible pact or agreement of non-aggression between the three limitrophe States of Turkey, Persia and Iraq, to which it was hoped Great Britain would adhere. His Excellency seemed to expect that His Majesty's Government would, now that Iraq was fully independent, consider that the Treaty of Angora no longer applied, so far as His Majesty's Government were concerned, and would desire to have the new situation formally recorded, and he appeared to think that this would give a suitable occasion to put forward the above proposal.

3. His Excellency promised to enlighten me further after his talks with Feroughi Khan.

4. I have sent a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister at Tehran.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 6031/34/44] No. 26.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received November 18.)

(No. 354.)

Sir, *Angora, November 2, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to report that the yearly ceremony of the opening of the Grand National Assembly was carried out on the 1st November. I enclose a copy of a French translation of a speech delivered on this occasion by the President of the Republic.(1)

2. The speech is colourless, and differs from previous speeches of the same kind in that, in its slight reference to foreign relations, it omits any mention of any Power by name. Even Persia, whose Foreign Minister, Feroughi Khan, was present at the ceremony as the guest of the Turkish Government, fails to obtain notice. It is curious, too, that no reference is made to Turkey's entry into the League of Nations.

3. The speech was delivered clearly and in resolute tones, and was received in silence by the Deputies with the exception of the passages relating to the

(1) Not printed.

intention of the Government to continue its programme of railway construction and to the necessity of international collaboration to secure peace and overcome the economic crisis. There was also applause towards the close of the speech, when the Gazi enjoined on all the State organisations the duty of working to restore the Turkish language to its primitive purity and beauty. I am told that this injunction is already being obeyed in the written language, and foresee that the purification of Turkish will rank, among the Gazi's reforms, with the abolition of the fez and the veil, the use of the vernacular in the mosques and the substitution of Latin for Arabic characters.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 6032/34/44] No. 27.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received November 18.)

(No. 355.)
Sir, *Angora, November 2, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to report that the annual celebrations of the anniversary of the proclamation of the Turkish Republic was held throughout Turkey on the 29th October.

2. The proceedings at Angora were to be on the usual lines. The President of the Republic would receive the members of the Diplomatic Corps, the troops and boy scouts would march past, the Government would entertain the heads of missions to dinner, and a ball would close the day. All these things duly came to pass, but with more incident than usual.

3. The opening event went off satisfactorily. The President of the Republic looked more alert and less statuesque than at previous receptions. He smiled a welcome to myself, and expressed a touching solicitude for Mr. Montgomery's broken finger, which prevented a presidential handshake, but not a friendly pat of sympathy. The reception over, all proceeded to the stands in front of the Grand National Assembly buildings to witness the review of the troops. The Gazi and Feroughi Khan, Persian Minister for Foreign Affairs and guest of the Turkish Government, took position. The Deputies endeavoured to take position also, but found their stand occupied by bodies of their constituents, who refused to budge on the ground that where the people was present in persons its representatives were not wanted. The review began, and the sturdy Anatolian soldiers passed with grim unimaginative faces, confirming one in the conviction that Turkey's military strength must never be ignored. Some sixty aeroplanes, in good formation, grazed the tops of the stands to the vociferous delight of all those spectators not in the stands. A small naval detachment received a welcome, warmer and more spontaneous than that already given to the senior service. Boy scouts, whom I have seen growing up for six years, whose moustaches now betray them as more than boys, and whose pale knees reveal them as less than scouts, goose-stepped by in seemingly never-ending rows. At length these, too, passed, and the Diplomatic Body was preparing to return home, when the crowd, which had caused constant trouble to the marching ranks of soldiery by encroaching on the narrow lane cleared for the review, broke through all cordons, and for half an hour chaos reigned in front of the presidential and diplomatic stands, while police, gendarmes and soldiers vainly endeavoured to resume control and open a way for traffic. Confusion, punctuated by screams, prevailed. Concern in the stands gave way to irritation at the public display of police inefficiency, and the anger of the Gazi rose to great heights.

4. Finally, the crowd was brought into subjection, and the official and diplomatic world was able to retire to prepare for the Government dinner to the heads of missions, on which I am reporting in my immediately following despatch.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R CLERK.

[E 6033/34/44] No. 28.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received November 18.)

(No. 356.)
Sir, *Angora, November 2, 1932.*

IN continuation of my immediately preceeding despatch I have the honour to report that the usual dinner to the heads of missions and the annual ball given by the Popular party duly took place at the Ankara Palace Hotel on the 29th October.

2. The Gazi arrived almost to time, but dinner was delayed while he discussed the events of the day with the two senior Turkish generals and M. de Chambrun and myself over several rounds of indifferent cocktails. In fact, the President was already fully primed before we sat down to dinner, and, as the accident of placing put me next but one to his Excellency, I observed with dismay that the process was being continued. As a rule on these occasions the President observes long periods of silence broken by intervals of more or less formal conversation with those in his immediate neighbourhood. This time he began to talk from the moment he sat down, eating nothing, smoking endless cigarettes, and drinking raki steadily. He began by saying to me, pointing to the Soviet Ambassador, who was on the opposite side of the table, that Comrade Suritz was a real and sincere friend of his and his oldest friend amongst the foreigners here, but that he had one other friend whom he put in the same class, namely, myself. He liked the others well enough, but we two were in a special category. As there was the usual hush that occurs whenever the Gazi speaks, everyone heard his words, which no doubt made their impression on my colleagues, though those of them who understand his Excellency will have realised, as I do, that this was his forcible way of saying that the policy of His Majesty's Government towards Turkey since the Mosul Treaty had convinced him of our sincerity.

3. The Gazi then turned to his right, where the rest of the Ambassadors were seated, and addressed each of them in turn. He was very cordial in his references to France and to M. de Chambrun's work which had culminated in the agreements that had just been concluded. He congratulated the Polish Ambassador on the regeneration of Poland, which was now once again a great country ready to play a worthy part in the progress of the world. He thanked the American Ambassador for his numerous public references in glorification of Turkey, added, with a touch of irony, that Mr. Sherrill, who has just been delivering a series of lectures on the Gazi in America, was, even more than American Ambassador in Turkey, the Turkish Ambassador in the United States, and asked him to make a speech in reply. Greatly to the surprise of his colleagues, Mr. Sherrill refrained.

4. It then came to the turn of the new Italian Ambassador, who was making his first acquaintance with a Turkish public occasion. The Gazi asked him point-blank what were his impressions of Turkey. M. Lojacono seized the opportunity to emphasise the particular intimacy of Turkey and Italy by saying that the great pleasure which he felt on coming here was enhanced by the natural and mutual attraction between two young nations, and he was considerably taken aback when the Gazi, fresh from proving the antiquity of the Turkish race and the Turkish nationality of Adam, pulled him up short and observed that no one coming from Rome should dare to speak of Italy as young, while as for Turkey, it was as old as humanity. The Gazi then alluded to the recent speech of M. Mussolini at Turin, and said that no doubt the representatives of England, France, Germany and Italy had been pleased at the Duce's assertion that if these four Powers collaborated they could ensure the peace and prosperity of Europe and the world. But he, the Gazi, was not pleased.

> "I tell you that he is wrong. The future of my country of 14 millions cannot be influenced or settled at the ruling or by the co-operation of any four Great Powers, nor will it be. Only the co-operation of *all* the Powers can restore peace to the world, and I, who want peace, and not war, wish this method to be followed. Let all combine to assure peace and fraternity."

His Excellency then stood up and raised a rather unsteady glass to the unity of mankind.

5. After a most embarrassing time for all, and not least for the Turks present—Kâzim Pasha, President of the Grand National Assembly, had throughout the dinner tried to restrain his chief—the Gazi led his guests to the ball-room and on passing the Egyptian Minister, who was wearing his fez, tapped it and said :—

"Tell your King that I, Mustafa Kemal, have instructed you not to wear your fez for this night."

He then called a waiter, to whom the Minister, gentle and universally liked, handed his tarboosh to avoid further scenes, and the noxious headgear was borne aloft before the President into a lane of mystified guests awaiting the emergence of the Gazi from the dining-hall, and consigned to outer darkness. The Egyptian Minister withdrew at once in deep distress. Numan Bey, Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, going at midnight to apologise, waited vainly on the doorstep. Tevfik Rüştü, following next day, was admitted to present apologies to the Minister. Until the reaction of King Fuad is known, the incident can hardly be considered closed.

6. Issuing forth from dinner the Gazi slowly progressed, pouncing here and there on all and sundry. The Japanese military attaché was hailed forth from the back rows, admired, shaken and kissed. The giant form of a Dutch attaché attracted the notice it deserved, but earned for its occupant a rebuke for its not being in uniform. Holland again, in the person of the first secretary's good-looking wife, was prominent, when the Gazi showed himself uncertain as to whether to salute her by kissing her hand, which was gloved, or her cheek. Baroness Breugel-Douglas was saved by the timely intervention of the French Ambassador, to whose staff attention was then transferred. The French naval attaché, short and stout, was tapped on his plump cheeks, and scolded for his lack of symmetry, and though kissed by the President was publicly informed that his corpulence incurred presidential displeasure and was unbecoming to a fighting man. While the naval attaché withdrew in high dudgeon the Gazi looked about for fresh material, and found the wife of the United States Ambassador, from whom extravagant compliments called forth equally extravagant rejoinders, in the course of which Mrs. Sherrill, in a clear, penetrating voice, announced to Mustafa Kemal that her husband was convinced, and lost no opportunity of saying, that Turkey's ruler was a super-Mussolini. The Italian Ambassador, posing as the Duce, whom he faintly resembles in face, behind Mrs. Sherrill, was shaken out of his calm and blinked twice before he could resume his pose. He can console himself by the knowledge that the two countries concerned have the same standard for measuring greatness.

7. Supported by Marshal Fevzi Pasha and the Soviet Ambassador, the Gazi at length reached his private alcove, where gentle disintegration set in. Vitality flickered again about 4 A.M., when all the middle-aged Turkish ladies who, arriving early, had settled down round the walls for a night's enjoyment, were rudely torn by the Gazi from their pleased and placid contemplation of foreign antics to perform these same antics themselves with strange and unknown foreigners.

8. It may seem unnecessary, and indeed unfitting, to report at such length in an official despatch the words and acts of one who was obviously at the time not completely master of himself, nor altogether mindful of his great and responsible position. My reason for troubling you is that every word that the Gazi utters on such occasions and in such a condition is not, as might be thought, an unguarded expression of what he feels. On the contrary, he wants his sentiments to be clearly known, and this annual dinner and ball is his one opportunity in the year to do so before all the foreign representatives, though hitherto he has always waited until after dinner before letting himself go. As a colleague of mine, whose knowledge of the Gazi is, next to that of the Soviet Ambassador, the longest and most intimate of all the foreigners in Turkey, has pointed out to me, the Gazi is fundamentally shy and his drinking is often, absurb though it may seem in a character of such proved strength, merely a means of getting over this inhibition. Unfortunately, the Gazi is sometimes too successful and does not keep entire control of his speech and actions, but he never loses control of his thoughts, and what he says when under the influence of drink, though it may be said with difficulty and incoherently, is the direct expression of what he thinks.

This is my reason for reporting to you what would otherwise be a trivial record of the vapourings of a great man at a moment when he had succumbed to his besetting weakness.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 6034/33/34] No. 29.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received November* 18.)

(No. 362.)

Sir, *Angora, November* 8, 1932.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 352 of the 31st October last, I have the honour to report that the following instruments were signed at Angora on the 5th instant by the Turkish and Persian Ministers for Foreign Affairs :—

1. A treaty of friendship,
2. A treaty of neutrality and of political and economic co-operation, and
3. An exchange of notes recording provisional agreement for extradition.

The first two are intended to renew the Treaty of Friendship and Security of the 22nd April, 1926, and its protocol of the 15th June, 1928 (see Tehran despatches No. 225 of the 8th May, 1926, and No. 306 of the 27th June, 1928). The text of all three instruments will be transmitted to you as soon as copies can be obtained.

2. Tevfik Rüştü Bey told me yesterday evening that the first two treaties were nothing more than the treaty of 1926 and the protocol of 1928, divided into two separate instruments. His Excellency added that as soon as he and the Persian Government had fixed the date for publication, he would give advance copies of the texts of all the agreements to myself and to my Russian, Persian, Iraq, and Afghan colleagues.

3. Feroughi Khan left with his suite for Constantinople on the evening of the same day, the 5th November, and was seen off by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, the Minister of National Defence, and numerous other officials. Several members of the Diplomatic Corps were also on the platform, including the counsellor of His Majesty's Embassy, whom I asked to represent me, as I was confined to the house with a chill. The party reached Constantinople the following morning, and Feroughi Khan is expected to remain there for several days, still as the guest of the Turkish Government, before leaving for Persia via Bagdad.

4. The press of the 6th November published an official communiqué, dated the 5th November, of which the following is a translation :—

"His Highness Mohammed Ali Khan Feroughi, Persian Minister for Foreign Affairs, had during his stay in Angora several interviews with his Excellency Ismet Pasha, President of the Council, and also with Tevfik Rüştü Bey, Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs. In the course of these interviews perfect conformity of political views was established.

"With a view to strengthening still further the relations of cordial friendship existing between the two countries, emphasis was laid on the great importance of personal contact between the friendly statesmen of the two friendly States, as also on the desirability of increasing the number of such meetings.

"Recent discussions have once again demonstrated the great benefits arising from the mutual comprehension and close co-operation of the two nations in the political and economic domains.

"Our Persian guests have been enabled, during their visit to Angora, to form an intimate acquaintance with all the manifestations of activity connected with the Kemalist régime, and have visited numerous Turkish establishments and institutions.

"With a view to renewing the Treaty of Friendship and Security of the 22nd April, 1926, as also its protocol dated the 15th June, 1928, the two Ministers for Foreign Affairs have this day signed two treaties, one of friendship and the other of neutrality and political and economic co-operation, and, in addition, a provisional agreement concerning extradition.

" The Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Persian Ambassador at Angora have also exchanged the instruments of ratification of the two treaties signed at Tehran, of which the first dealt with the delimitation of the Turco-Persian frontier, and the second covered questions of arbitration, conciliation and judicial procedure."

5. I have sent copies of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister at Tehran.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 6035/6030/65] No. 30.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received November* 18.)

(No. 363.)

Sir, *Angora, November* 9, 1932.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 353 of the 31st October last, I have the honour to report that when the Minister for Foreign Affairs was talking to me of the political agreements made with his Highness Feroughi Khan, as recorded in my despatch No. 362 of yesterday, he again alluded to a possible pact of non-aggression between Turkey, Persia, Iraq and Great Britain. His Excellency said that Feroughi Khan and he had agreed that the Government in each of the three limitrophe countries—he appeared to take the assent of Iraq to this plan, notwithstanding the change of Prime Minister, for granted—should sound His Majesty's Government as to whether the idea found favour with them. Tevfik Rüştü Bey said that in thus speaking to me he considered that he had done his part of the sounding, and emphasised that there was nothing whatever official in his *démarche*.

2. When the Minister for Foreign Affairs spoke to me he was so vague and seemed to have so little an idea in his own mind of what he really wanted that I felt I could not report to you without more precise data, and being myself confined to the house, I asked Mr. Morgan to attack his Excellency on my behalf. The result is contained in the enclosed memorandum from Mr. Morgan of his interview with the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

3. While Tevfik Rüştü Bey's proposal calls for considerably closer definition and a careful study of all its implications, which I doubt if Tevfik Rüştü himself has given to it, I venture to submit that it should not be turned down out of hand. It is not unlikely that Tevfik Rüştü, who will probably be going to Geneva towards the end of this month, will take the opportunity when there to raise the question personally with you, and meanwhile little harm and much good would be done if I were authorised to tell his Excellency that the question is receiving the very careful consideration which is called for by its importance.

4. I am sending copies of this despatch to His Majesty's representatives at Moscow, Bagdad, Tehran and Kabul.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

Enclosure in No. 30.

Memorandum.

DR. TEVFIK RÜSTÜ'S idea is that Turkey, Persia, Iraq and Great Britain should conclude a " plurilateral " agreement of non-aggression. Each party to the agreement would bind itself not to attack any of the others. He could see no reason why they should not do this, as all the countries concerned were members of the League, and the terms of the proposed agreement merely repeated what members of the League were already bound to do under the Kellogg–Briand Pact, and the terms of the Covenant of the League. Its peculiarity lay in the fact that the general principles of the League would be given a " regional " application. Turkey's support of the proposal arose from the fact that she wanted to do in the

East what she had done in the West, namely, assure peace for herself by making agreements of friendship with her neighbours. His one desire was for peace. He would not be drawn into war under any consideration, as Turkey must have years of peace to carry out her work of interior reform and reconstruction. But while he was willing to make agreements of friendship with every nation, he would not be drawn into any treaties of alliance or definite engagements with any Power or group of Powers which might necessitate Turkey's taking part in a war or taking sides in a war, nor had he been drawn into such engagements. He would never, as long as he held office, sign any document which would engage present-day Turkey, or coming generations of Turks, to engage in war. But there were possibilities which frightened him. He was in a " blue funk " as to what might happen if Russia and Roumania went to war. Reverting to the project of the " plurilateral " agreement, Tevfik Rüştü said he thought that the time was favourable for it, as the greatest friendliness prevailed between all the parties concerned. I asked how Great Britain came to be included in the scheme, seeing that it was to be an agreement between, as he said, limitrophe States, and also why Syria was excluded. He said Great Britain had a maritime frontier with all the States concerned. She was " the " sea Power. Syria was excluded because she was not an independent State. She was not in a position to sign for herself and to bind herself. He made it plain that one of the principal benefits—if not the main one—which would accrue to Turkey would be that she would then feel sure of her being able to preserve her neutrality, and of having her neutrality respected.

I asked him if he had spoken of his scheme to Sir John Simon at Geneva. He said he had not, and it seemed to me that it had taken concrete shape in his mind since his recent conversations with Feroughi Khan.

This impression was deepened when he went on to say that, if the " plurilateral " agreement could be realised, it might then be followed up eventually by an agreement between Persia and her northern neighbour, and between Persia and Afghanistan—which would complete the " plurilateral " agreement. These two neighbours of Persia, by signing pacts of non-aggression with Persia, would place Persia in a position like that of Switzerland. She would be certain of having her neutrality respected. Turkey would be greatly relieved also, as all the land means of contact or of clash between the two Great Powers (England and Russia) being eliminated, Turkey could live quiet days without anxiety or care. As to what the two Great Powers might do to each other on sea, that would be far away from Turkey.

It seemed to me as he spoke that Feroughi Khan had given him to understand, or that Tevfik Rüştü had read into Feroughi Khan's utterances, or, with his pre-conceived notions had led himself to believe after conversation with Feroughi Khan, that Persia wanted to feel and be assured that she would not be used as a pawn or as a battlefield in a possible Anglo-Russian conflict, or be converted into an arena of Anglo-Russian rivalry. She wanted, as Tevfik Rüştü said, a position like that of Switzerland.

The sanction for the proposed plurilateral agreement would be that if " A " broke his word towards " B," then " C " and " D," while not being obliged to take any action, would, perforce, see that " A's " word was not to be trusted, and that, as he had already broken his word towards " B," he could, without scruple, break his word towards " C " and " D " also. " C " and " D " would then take whatever measures seemed to be necessary or expedient.

I said that, as he knew, Great Britain refused in general to be drawn into any entanglements or alliances with any Power or group of Powers, or to bind itself to any group, and he replied that this was precisely Turkey's attitude, but that the agreement he proposed would not prejudice this attitude, since it was, in sum, a local and " regional " application of League principles already subscribed to by the parties to his proposed pact.

My general impression was that he wanted Turkey at all cost to remain neutral in a big war, and, more particularly—as it concerned Turkey most nearly—a war between Great Britain and the Soviet republics. He wanted, by prior agreements, to put Turkey in the position of not having to declare herself for either side, and, as both the possible belligerents would have already agreed with Turkey to commit no act of aggression against her, neither would violate her neutrality and therefore neither would get at the other across her territory. The war would therefore not come Turkey's way, and therefore not oblige her to

participate, or face the dilemma of whether to participate or not, and also that of having to decide on which side to participate.

Tevfik Rüştü's interest in Persia's being a party to the proposed pact was that, if Persia were a party, and if Russia and Afghanistan were likewise parties, Persia also could not become a bone of contention between the two Great Powers and would not have her neutrality violated, or be in a similar dilemma to that of Turkey—as described above. Moreover, as no troops of the two Great Powers would be moving near the Turco-Persian frontier, Turkey would be more completely certain of avoiding trouble with either belligerent, as there would be no possibility of an "incident" on the Turco-Persian frontier which might oblige Turkey to decide whether to take action or no.

But while Turkey could secure herself by the proposed pact from trouble, or dreadful necessities of choice, in case of an Anglo-Russian war, she does not like to think of the possibilities of a Russo-Roumanian war.

A final saying of Tevfik Rüştü's was that his pact, as ultimately completed, would be useful for Great Britain in India.

JAMES MORGAN.

Angora, November 9, 1932.

E 6036/5774/89 No. 31.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received November 18.)

(No. 365.)

Sir, *Angora, November* 6, 1932.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 347 of the 29th October last, I have the honour to report that my French colleague has been good enough to give me an account of the agreements which, as reported in that despatch, he has just signed with the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and has undertaken to let me have the texts in due course.

2. The question of the "biens syriens" has been settled on the basis that Syrians are either to have their properties in this country restored to them, or, where that proves impossible, to be indemnified. In return, the restrictive measures which the Syrian and Lebanese authorities have hitherto applied to Turkish properties in Syria are to be removed, and the Turkish owners are to have full liberty to deal with the properties as they wish. Any disputes will be decided by a Franco-Turkish Commission, to which, in case of failure to agree, there will be added, so M. de Chambrun informs me, a neutral president selected by the President of the Swiss Federation. All this applies to "biens immobiliers." Claims for personal property will be dealt with by local jurisdiction in the case of Syrians in Turkey by the Turkish courts, and, in the case of Turks in Syria and the Lebanon before the Mixed Franco-Syrian Courts, the terms of article 11 of the agreement assimilating them, for the purpose of prosecution of these claims, to French nationals.

3. As regards the railway, the agreement is recorded in a protocol. The intention is that the existing French management of the railway from Adana to Nisibin should be liquidated within twelve months, during which time an effort will be made to substitute a new form of exploitation whereby the present system of management would remain in force over so much of the line as lies in Syria and a Turkish company would be formed with French capital to work the railway in Turkish territory, with the exception of the section from Adana to Fevzi Pasha, which will, in any case, be handed over entirely to the Turkish authorities within six months and be incorporated in the Turkish State railway system. The protocol lays down that all this is provisional, and that if on closer examination the scheme proves impracticable, some other solution will be sought.

4. I am not in a position to express any opinion as to whether such an agreement in any way prejudices the rights of the shareholders of the Bagdad Railway, though I should imagine that, in any case, an agreement that ensures an efficient and possibly profitable exploitation of any part of the line should in practice be to their benefit. But M. de Chambrun is under the impression

that the Turks and the French together hold the majority of the shares, and that, therefore, the two Governments could, if need be, call together the long-slumbering general meeting and obtain legal sanction for their proposals.

5. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador in Paris.

I have, &c.
(For the Ambassador),
JAMES MORGAN.

[E 6038/1541/44] No. 32.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received November 18.)

(No. 367.)

Sir, *Angora, November* 12, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to report that the Grand National Assembly, at its sitting of the 7th November, was moved to enthusiasm by the reading of a letter from the President of the French Chamber of Deputies, announcing that the Chamber had, on the 16th July, 1932, passed a resolution of cordial congratulation to Turkey on her entry into the League of Nations. In the text of the resolution, which, though voted in July, could not be communicated earlier to the Assembly on account of the summer recess, emphasis was laid on France's tradition of friendship towards Turkey, and the latter's entry into the League was hailed as a happy factor of future peace.

2. Zeki Mesut Bey, Deputy for Adrianople and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, described the courteous act of the French Chamber as a sign, not only of France's friendship, but also of the success of Turkey's policy of peace. Turkey's steadfastness of purpose and loftiness of ideals in her pursuit of peace had excited the admiration of other nations, and not least of those represented at Geneva. Franco-Turkish friendship, based on mutual esteem, would give fruitful results in international affairs, and had been happily demonstrated in the past few days by the satisfactory solution of certain thorny questions separating the two countries. He proposed that a reply should be sent to the French Chamber expressing the feelings of profound emotion and gratitude awakened in the Assembly by the French Chamber's manifestation of friendliness to Turkey, and declaring Turkey's intention to co-operate with friendly France, and with all other nations, in the path of peace.

3. Ismet Pasha then rose and said that, in view of France's display of friendship to Turkey, it was eminently fitting that the Grand National Assembly should reciprocate, and should show its satisfaction and gratitude. The Government gladly associated itself with the motion. A vote was then taken, and the resolution was unanimously passed amid applause.

4. It is pleasing to be able to record this official demonstration of friendship toward France, which is in agreeable contrast to the anti-French attitude hitherto prevailing. It is, of course, inspired, and is partly due to the recent settlement of Turco-French differences in regard to Syrian affairs, as reported in my despatch No. 347 of the 29th October last, and partly to the hope of favours to come. How long Turkey's friendship will last and how long it will be reflected in the press and in public opinion is entirely a matter for those in power in Turkey to determine.

5. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador in Paris.

I have, &c.
(For the Ambassador),
JAMES MORGAN.

[E 6039/5409/44] No. 33.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received November 18.)

(No. 368.)

Sir, *Angora, November* 12, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to report that the Turkish press on the 8th November announced that an American specialist had been engaged to reorganise the Turkish Customs, and would shortly arrive in Constantinople.

2. I now learn from the United States Embassy that a Mr. Vorfeld, the expert in question, has just arrived in Angora, and has taken up his duties.

I have, &c.
(For the Ambassador),
JAMES MORGAN.

[E 6041/33/34] No. 34.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(Received November 18.)

(No. 370.)

Sir, *Angora, November* 12, 1932.

WITH reference to Mr. Hoare's despatch No. 358 of the 19th August last, I have the honour to report that the exchange of ratifications of the Turco-Persian Frontier Agreement, signed at Tehran on the 23rd January, 1932, was effected at Angora on the 5th November, as stated in the last paragraph of the official Turkish communiqué, a translation of which was enclosed in my despatch No. 362 of the 8th instant.

2. The same paragraph of the communiqué records the exchange of ratifications of a Turco-Persian agreement, also signed at Tehran, covering questions of arbitration, conciliation and judicial procedure. The archives of His Majesty's Embassy appear to contain no record of this further agreement beyond a reference in the enclosure in Mr. Hoare's despatch No. 46 of the 27th January, 1932, and I should be grateful if I could be supplied with a copy of the text in due course.

3. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister in Tehran.

I have, &c.
JAMES MORGAN.

[E 6043/5774/89] No. 35.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received November 18.)

(No. 372.)

Sir, *Angora, November* 12, 1932.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 366 of to-day's date, in which I recorded the hesitation of my French colleague to supply me with a copy of the Franco-Turkish agreement regarding the future of the portion of the Bagdad Railway lying between Bozanti and Nissibin, I have the honour to transmit to you the accompanying copy of the agreement, for which I am indebted to the spontaneous courtesy of Cavat Bey, head of the First Department of the Turkish Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

2. I am sending a copy of this despatch and of its enclosure to His Majesty's Ambassador at Paris.

I have, &c.
(For the Ambassador),
JAMES MORGAN.

Enclosure in No. 35.

Franco-Turkish Agreement respecting the Bagdad Railway between Bozanti and Nissibin.

PROCÈS-VERBAL(1) de signature de la déclaration commune en date du 27 octobre 1932 relative aux chemins de fer.

Sans préjudice à des [*sic*] dispositions du préambule de la déclaration commune, les signataires s'accordent pour reconnaître que le délai d'un an maximum s'applique aux dispositions des paragraphes (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) de cette déclaration, délai au delà duquel chacune des hautes parties contractantes pourra reprendre sa liberté d'action.

DR. TEVFIK RÜSTU.
CHARLES DE CHAMBRUN.

Ankara, le 27 octobre 1932.

Déclaration commune.

LE Gouvernement turc et le Gouvernement français, animés du désir de resserrer les liens d'une amicale collaboration sur la frontière turco-syrienne, et reconnaissant qu'il est de leur commun intérêt de définir, dans l'esprit de l'article 10 de l'accord d'Ankara du 20 octobre 1921, les conditions de fonctionnement normal de la section du "Chemin de Fer de Bagdad" comprise entre Alexandrette et les au-delà de Nissibin, et d'assurer le prolongement de ce chemin de fer vers l'est, déclarent leur intention d'apporter tous leurs soins à la valorisation du réseau et de favoriser à cette fin, par une collaboration des deux parties, la conclusion d'un accord au sein de la Société concessionnaire des Chemins de Fer de Bagdad, en vue d'établir un régime rationnel conforme aux intérêts du trafic entre la Turquie et la Syrie.

Pour assurer la réalisation de ces intentions les hautes parties contractantes conviennent :

(*a*) De procéder à la liquidation de l'exploitation actuelle, dans le délai maximum d'un an;

(*b*) D'assurer de concert, en attendant l'établissement d'un régime définitif, le fonctionnement normal du réseau et la continuité du trafic sur l'ensemble de ce réseau;

(*c*) De rechercher à cette fin, au cours du délai d'un an susvisé, un accord relatif à une exploitation provisoire, soit par l'entremise de compagnies constituées conformément aux dispositions du protocole ci-annexé, soit, si l'application de ce protocole se heurtait à des difficultés insurmontables, par tout autre mode de gestion directe ou indirecte répondant au but poursuivi.

Jusqu'à l'expiration du délai maximum d'un an nécessaire à la liquidation de l'exploitation actuelle et à l'établissement d'un nouveau régime provisoire, l'état de choses présent ne sera pas modifié. Toutefois, le secteur Adana–Fevzi Pacha sera remis au Gouvernement turc six mois après la signature du présent accord.

DR. T. RÜSTU.
CHARLES DE CHAMBRUN.

Ankara, le 27 octobre 1932.

---

(1) *Note.*—This *procès-verbal* was not originally communicated to Sir G. Clerk, but was subsequently published in the Turkish press.

Protocole relatif à l'Etablissement d'un nouveau Régime et à la Liquidation de l'Exploitation actuelle.

ARTICLE 1er.

LE Gouvernement turc assurera l'exploitation de la section Bozanti–Adana–Fevzi Pacha.

L'exploitation des sections Payas–Toprak Kalé, Fevzi Pacha–Meïdan Ekbès et Tchoban Bey–Nissibin, sises en territoire turc, sera confiée à une société à capitaux français, constituée sous le régime des lois turques, et dans laquelle une participation pourra être réservée à des capitaux turcs. Ladite société s'entendra avec le Gouvernement turc pour déterminer les conditions de cette exploitation.

L'exploitation des sections Alexandrette–Payas, Meïdan Ekbès–Tchoban Bey et prolongement en territoire syrien au delà de Nissibin, sises en territoire syrien, sera confiée à une société constituée sous le régime des lois françaises.

ARTICLE 2.

Un accord interviendra entre les chemins de fer de l'Etat turc, la société turque et la société française pour régler les conditions du trafic.

Cet accord portera notamment :

(*a*) Sur le droit de passage moyennant péage des convois de la société turque et de la société française sur la section Toprak Kalé–Fevzi Pacha, exploitée par les chemins de fer de l'Etat turc;

(*b*) Sur les conditions de fixation des tarifs de transport pour cette section qui intéresse les trois exploitations.

Aucun tarif différentiel ne pourra être établi en principe sur cette section. Cependant, les Gouvernements se réservent le droit d'étudier, le cas échéant, d'un commun accord, toute dérogation à cette règle qui deviendrait nécessaire.

Dans les conditions fixées par le protocole, Annexe V de l'Accord d'Ankara du 30 mai 1926, la Turquie aura le droit de faire ses transports militaires par chemin de fer de Meïdan Ekbès à Tchoban Bey à travers le territoire syrien, et la Syrie aura le droit de faire ses transports militaires par chemin de fer de Tchoban Bey à Nissibin à travers le territoire turc.

ARTICLE 3.

La répartition du matériel et des approvisionnements sera effectuée d'un commun accord entre les intéressés.

En cas de désaccord sur cette répartition, il sera fait appel à un arbitre désigné par l'organisation des communications et du transit de la Société des Nations.

ARTICLE 4.

Le Gouvernement turc renonce, en son nom propre, à toute réclamation sur les produits d'exploitation depuis la prise en charge de la section visée au paragraphe 1 de l'article 1er par la société française actuellement exploitante jusqu'à la date de sa remise au Gouvernement turc, et donne pour la part lui revenant quitus définitif des comptes afférents à cette exploitation.

ARTICLE 5.

Pour une durée de quinze années, à compter de la date de la signature du présent protocole et à moins qu'un accord n'intervienne au cours de cette période pour fixer le régime définitif de ce chemin de fer, la Turquie et la Syrie ne feront pas usage de leur droit de rachat, sans s'être préalablement mises d'accord.

Toutefois, le Gouvernement turc se réserve la faculté de faire usage de son droit de rachat, pour les sections Payas–Toprak Kalé et Fevzi Pacha–Meïdan Ekbès, à partir de la quatrième année de la prise en charge de l'exploitation de ces sections par la société turque, moyennant préavis de trois mois à cette dernière.

De même, la société turque exploitant la section Tchoban Bey–Nissibin aura le droit, à toute époque, à partir de la quatrième année de sa prise en charge de l'exploitation de cette section, de renoncer à cette exploitation moyennant préavis de trois mois.

ARTICLE 6.

Les droits conférés par le présent protocole à la société exploitant les sections sises en territoire turc ne seront en aucun cas transférables à une autre société, sauf accord préalable avec le Gouvernement turc.

Fait en double exemplaire à Ankara le 27 octobre 1932.

DR. TEVFIK RÜSTÜ.
CHARLES DE CHAMBRUN.

Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs to French Ambassador.

M. l'Ambassadeur, *Ankara, le 27 octobre* 1932.

ME référant au protocole que nous avons signé en date de ce jour, il me paraît utile de préciser à votre Excellence que l'organisation de la direction de la société turque dont la constitution est prévue à l'article 1er, paragraphe 2, de ce protocole, sera analogue à celle de la Compagnie des Chemins de Fer Izmir–Kasaba; cette société aura toute liberté pour faire une entente avec la société française exploitant en Syrie, en vue d'assurer l'unité de direction et de fonctionnement nécessaire à l'exploitation.

Je vous prie, &c.
DR. TEVFIK RÜSTÜ.

Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs to French Ambassador.

M. l'Ambassadeur, *Ankara, le 27 octobre* 1932.

ME référant au protocole que nous avons signé en date de ce jour, j'ai l'honneur de faire connaître à votre Excellence qu'en cas de licenciement du personnel actuellement employé sur la section qui sera restituée au Gouvernement de la République turque dans un délai de six mois à dater de la signature du présent protocole, il sera procédé suivant la règle observée pour le licenciement du personnel de la ligne Mersin–Adana.

Je vous prie, &c.
DR. TEVFIK RÜSTÜ.

French Ambassador to Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs.

M. le Ministre, *Ankara, le 27 octobre* 1932.

J'AI l'honneur d'accuser réception des deux lettres que votre Excellence a bien voulu m'adresser pour être annexées au protocole que nous venons de signer à la date de ce jour.

En prenant acte de ces documents, je vous renouvelle, &c.
CHARLES DE CHAMBRUN.

E 6523/6523/44 No. 36.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(Received December 9.)

(No. 19.)
(Telegraphic.) *Angora, December 9*, 1932.

NOTE has been sent to Turkey by Egyptian Government in regard to the incident of the fez described in Sir G. Clerk's despatch No. 356.(1) Government and press here flatly deny that any incident took place, and claim that President of the Republic kindly permitted the Minister to remove fez on account of the heat. There is a tendency to brazen the matter out and be truculent to Egypt, and also to blame *Daily Herald* and Reuter for bringing alleged untrue version of the matter to the notice of Egyptian people, with design to create bad feeling against Turkey.

Denial is deliberate, and is, I assume, intended to offer means of settling question without necessity of a public apology.

(1) See No. 28.

[E 6679/6523/44] No. 37.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(*Received December* 15.)

(No. 399.)
Sir, *Angora, December* 10, 1932.

IN the course of his despatch No. 356 of the 2nd November, regarding the celebration of the anniversary of the proclamation of the Turkish Republic, Sir George Clerk described the incident of the removal of the Egyptian Minister's tarboosh at the close of the official banquet to heads of missions, on the direct and peremptory insistence of the President of the Republic.

2. Silence closed down on the event immediately after its occurrence, broken occasionally, at some social function, by a stray remark from one Government official or another, showing in the first few hours sympathy with the Egyptian Minister, and then, by a sudden change of opinion—perhaps in parasitic and terrified deference to the Gazi who must, on realising his indiscretion, have determined to brazen it out—suggesting that the blame for the incident lay with the Egyptian Minister, who had courted a snub by wearing a fez in a country where it was regarded as anathema. The silence has in the past few days, given place to the clamour of the whole Turkish press, arising out of the communication to the Turkish Government of an Egyptian note calling for apologies and for guarantees against future repetition. The press flatly denies that any incident took place, and accuses the *Daily Herald* and Reuter's Agency of lying, or, at least, of distorting an innocent episode, with the object of creating bad blood between Turkey and Egypt. It rebukes the Egyptian press and gutter politicians for continuing to try to make capital out of an incident now shown to have never occurred, and hints that if Egypt does not accept Turkey's explanations harmful results may follow for a country notorious as a drug smuggler, for harbouring Turkish reactionaries, and for striking at Turkish trade by its tariffs.

3. The version which the Turkish press now wishes to see adopted is that it is customary for the Gazi to intimate to the heads of missions, at the end of the official banquet on the 29th October, that they may, for their greater comfort, change from uniform to evening dress before appearing at the ball, which closes the national holiday. It happened this year that, on leaving the table, the Gazi saw the Egyptian Minister for whom he has a great regard, and realising that the heat of the room made the wearing of his fez a burden to him kindly gave him permission to remove it. None of those present were aware that an "incident" had taken place until the 12th November, when the *Daily Herald*—an Opposition newspaper—printed the totally false information that the Gazi had ordered Hamza Bey to remove his fez, that the offended Minister had at once withdrawn, and that the Gazi had subsequently conveyed to him his apologies. Reuter's Agency therefore disseminated this report in Egypt, and some Egyptians, who ought to have known better than to give credence to a belated press report from London, were led to believe that Egypt's honour was at stake and began a campaign against Turkey. The object of the whole fabrication was to create a coolness between Turkey and Egypt, and had an exact counterpart in the Ems telegram which caused the Franco-German War in 1870. A leading article of Yunus Nadi in the *République* of the 8th December, of which I enclose a copy, is typical of all the other press articles.(1)

4. A semi-official statement in the same number of the *République* mentions the violence of the Egyptian press, due to certain lying reports of an incident which never occurred, and refers to an Egyptian note to the Turkish Government demanding apologies and guarantees for future non-recurrence. It adds that a reply has been drafted, and is to the effect that the fact that the Egyptian Minister was told that he could remove his fez cannot possibly be interpreted as a slight on Egypt's honour, and therefore no question of apologies or guarantees can arise. The semi-official statement concludes by suggesting that unless Egypt persists in trying to create an incident out of something which never took place, the matter will be considered as closed, and as having served the useful purpose of giving Turkey an opportunity of demonstrating its friendship for Egypt.

5. It is obvious that the Turkish Government does not wish the matter to develop further, and that it has been driven to publish a false version because a

(1) Not printed.

true account would be humiliating for its President and itself. It is probable, too, that it hopes that its version will convince and content Egyptian opinion, and thus allow the Egyptian Government to withdraw or soften its demands. I gather from the Egyptian Minister that his Government had hoped that the matter would fade into oblivion without the necessity for action on its part. It may perhaps find it expedient to accept the Turkish explanation. It would be a pity if a trivial indiscretion of one who was at the time not completely master of himself should embitter relations between two countries.

6. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's representative in Cairo.

I have, &c.
JAMES MORGAN.

[E 6709/6523/44] No. 38.

Sir P. Loraine to Sir John Simon.—(*Received December* 16.)

(No. 224. Confidential.)
(Telegraphic.) *Cairo, December* 16, 1932.

SIR G. CLERK'S despatch No. 356.

I fear developments of tarboosh incident are serious, and that danger of a rupture between Turkey and Egypt is disagreeably close.

I recently received visit from Turkish Chargé d'Affaires, who spoke quite personally and unofficially. What came out is that Egyptian request for assurance for the future has aroused indignation in Turkey, that Turkish Government are making it a national issue to back up the Ghazi and cover up his blunder, and will, therefore, not take much trouble to avoid a rupture. He had not yet received text of Turkish note to be handed to Egyptian Government, but understood that besides probably unpalatable portions it would contain passages of which Egyptian Government could take act in such manner as to score a satisfaction. What Turks really want is to find a formula which, without giving Ghazi away, can be regarded by Egyptians as a satisfaction, but cannot be construed as a Turkish surrender. This to be coupled with a withdrawal of notes. He insisted that unless a solution were found soon it would be too late to get one.

Chargé d'Affaires also said impression existed at Angora that England, and especially London press, had written up the incident in order to drive a wedge between Turkey and Egypt.

As regards this point, I said if such childish nonsense was believed by Turkish Government I had nothing whatever to say. He said there was no such responsibility suggested against His Majesty's Government or against myself.

I then said that in my opinion as a private individual the Ghazi had been in the wrong, and that some satisfaction was due to Egypt. I saw no reason why Turkish Government should not at least assure Egyptian Government that their national costume enjoyed every respect. As we were always desirous that Egypt should be on harmonious terms with her neighbours, I would discuss the matter with Sidky but on a purely personal basis.

Later in the same evening I saw Sidky and told him gist of what Turkish Chargé d'Affaires had said. Sidky said he certainly desired no quarrel with Turkey. Idea of withdrawing Egyptian note was, however, repugnant to him; and he could not help resenting apparent attempt of Turkey to browbeat Egypt, who was the offended party and entitled to satisfaction. He did not believe Egyptian interests would suffer by a withdrawal of Egyptian diplomatic and consular missions, and knew he could rely on British help to watch over them as in the past.

He had not received Turkish note, but he promised to look at it carefully in search for a method of honourable solution, and said he would consult me personally again before doing anything.

I trust you will approve my language. On each occasion I spoke only in a personal capacity. As both parties had come to me about this storm in a hat, I judged it advisable to exert personal influence in a calming sense.

(Repeated to Angora.)

E 6709/6523/44 No. 39.

Sir John Simon to Sir P. Loraine (Cairo).

(No. 247.)
(Telegraphic.) *Foreign Office, December* 19, 1932.

YOUR telegram No. 224 of 16th December: Tarboosh incident.

I entirely approve your language, and trust that you will have further opportunity to continue to exercise your influence in favour of early and amicable settlement.

(Repeated to Angora, No. 33.)

E 6836/6523/44 No. 40.

Sir P. Loraine to Sir John Simon.—(Received December 23.)

(No. 229.)
(Telegraphic.) *Cairo, December* 23, 1932.

YOUR telegram No. 247.

Prime Minister privately communicated to me text of Turkish reply to Egyptian note.

Turkish note expresses surprise at Egyptian account of a fact which had been amicably discussed by Minister for Foreign Affairs and Egyptian Minister, who had agreed regarding signification to be attached to the Ghazi's words, *i.e.*, that it was merely a normal invitation to him to remove his tarboosh for comfort's sake. There could therefore be no question of expression of regret by Minister for Foreign Affairs in that conversation about an incident which had not occurred. Note then refers to tendentious and invented news, which were able to cloud friendly Turco-Egyptian relations by deforming the meaning of a friendly gesture. With regard to Egyptian national head-dress, every State was free to adopt the uniform it wished, as it was natural that every State should regulate its protocol by taking into consideration the exigencies of national and international life.

Note concludes with a very cordial expression of desire of Turkish Government to maintain and strengthen the friendly relations between the two peoples.

In communicating this note Prime Minister sent me an informal [? group omitted] to the effect that draft Egyptian reply would be discussed by Cabinet on 22nd December. I at once sent his Excellency a private letter informing him that you had asked me to continue to exercise my personal influence in the direction of an amicable settlement. I therefore expressed hope that he would be able to find in Turkish note the possibility of an amicable settlement.

Yesterday afternoon Prime Minister replied by sending me draft Egyptian reply, and adding that he had delayed its submission to the Cabinet in order to profit by my views.

Egyptian reply in courteous terms regrets Turkish version and maintains Egyptian version of incident. Recognising friendly protestations of Turkish note, Egyptian Government does not wish to refer again to questions dealt with in notes of the two Governments, but maintains its previous request for assurances regarding right of Egyptian diplomatic representatives to wear their national head-dress.

In response to private representations by me, Prime Minister said that subject to consultation with his Ministers he was disposed to modify note so as to avoid demand of assurances and to take act of relevant passage in Turkish note as admitting Egyptian claim regarding national head-dress (see last sentence of paragraph 2 above). Advantage of this modification is that Egyptian note need not be answered unless Turkish Government wish to be unreasonable, while Turkish silence can be regarded by Egyptian Government as admission of its claim.

I was careful to explain that I had no wish to dictate line of action, but was merely acquainting him with ideas which had occurred to me for a friendly settlement which was in the interest of both countries.

Should Turkish Government show signs of intransigence you will doubtless consider advisability of authorising His Majesty's Ambassador at Angora to exercise such similar moderating influence as may be possible.

(Repeated to Angora.)

E 6837/6523/44 No. 41.

Sir P. Loraine to Sir John Simon.—(Received December 26.)

(No. 232. Confidential.)
(Telegraphic.) *Cairo, December* 26, 1932.

MY telegram No. 229.

Sidky has communicated to me privately final text of his note to Turkish Government, which is wholly commendable. His deference to my counsels of moderation has been even greater than I thought possible. All controversial discussion of incident has been omitted, my suggestions as pointed out in my telegram under reference have been adopted, note requires no answer, and as it courteously takes act of assurances implied in Turkish note, it seems inconceivable that the Turks could find anything objectionable in it.

Sidky has made it plain to me, however, that, if nevertheless Turks make trouble, he intends to withdraw Egyptian diplomatic and consular missions.

If Turks reject this olive branch, I for my part shall be satisfied that they wish to pick a quarrel

Please repeat to Angora.

(Repeated by Foreign Office to Angora, No. 34.)

E 6837/6523/44 No. 42.

Sir John Simon to Mr. Morgan (Angora).

(No. 35.)
(Telegraphic.) *Foreign Office, December* 28, 1932.

SIR P. LORAINE'S telegram No. 229 of 23rd December: Turco-Egyptian relations—Fez incident, last paragraph.

I leave to your discretion any informal moderating influence.

(Repeated to Cairo, No. 251.)

E 6902/6523/44 No. 43.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(Received December 29.)

(No. 21.)
(Telegraphic.) *Angora, December* 29, 1932.

YOUR telegram No. 35.

I yesterday urged on the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs desirability of accepting the moderate and conciliatory Egyptian reply as final and satisfactory closing of incident. He paid tribute to moderating influence exercised in Cairo and London by the representatives of His Majesty's Government, and said that telegraphed summary of reply which had just reached Angora seemed to be very satisfactory, and finally to dispose of question, unless text of note when received caused Turkish Government to think otherwise, which was unlikely.

To-day a semi-official communiqué in Turkish press states summary of Egyptian reply has made a good impression here, and that gratification will be felt in both countries at amicable end of question which had arisen between the two sister nations.

(Repeated to Cairo.)

[E 6954/847/44]

No. 44.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(*Received December* 31.)

(No. 407.) *Angora, December* 19, 1932.

Sir,

WITH reference to Sir George Clerk's despatch No. 316 of the 27th September last, and to previous correspondence relative to the completion of the railway between Samsun and Sivas, I have the honour to report that the first through communication by rail between Angora and Samsun was inaugurated here on the 15th December. The first through coach for Samsun, which had left Haydarpaşa the evening before, was attached to the daily train from Angora to Kayseri and Sivas, and the occasion was celebrated by the presence on the platform at Angora of the Minister of Public Works and a number of his subordinates, as well as a small crowd of onlookers. It may be presumed that more people would have been present had the press not announced that the "ceremony" would take place at 11·15, whereas the train left punctually at 11. The engine and the special Samsun coach were decorated with Turkish flags, and on a placard suspended from the funnel were the words: "Greetings from Angora to Samsun by the first through train." When the train moved out of the station not a cheer was raised nor a hat waved, a fact which did not deter the press from referring to the scenes of enthusiasm which the occasion called forth.

2. The through portion of the train reached Samsun at 8 P.M. on the following day, *i.e.*, after a journey of thirty-three hours, and at 5·30 P.M. on that day the first train from Samsun arrived at Angora, whence a portion of it left for Mersin, via Eskişehir, bearing the inscription: "Greetings from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean." Through communication between Haydarpaşa and Samsun via Angora is to be effected three times weekly in each direction, leaving Haydarpaşa on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, and Samsun on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays. I enclose a time-table showing the hours of departure from and arrival at each terminus and the principal intermediate stations.(1)

3. Except on the Haydarpaşa–Angora section of the line, no sleeping- nor restaurant-car will be at the disposal of travellers to or from Samsun. The sleeping-car which was run for some months between Haydarpaşa and Sivas and *vice versa* has recently been taken off, as it was used, on the Angora–Sivas sector, by only about half-a-dozen passengers during the whole of that period.

4. I am sending a copy of this despatch to the Department of Overseas Trade and to His Majesty's consulates at Mersin and Trebizond.

I have, &c.

JAMES MORGAN.

(1) Not printed.

[E 6904/33/34]

No. 45.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(*Received December* 30.)

(No. 411.) *Angora, December* 20, 1932.

Sir,

WITH reference to Sir George Clerk's despatch No. 362 of the 8th November, 1932, in which he reported the signature of a treaty of friendship and a treaty of neutrality and of political and economic co-operation between Turkey and Persia, I have the honour to inform you that the texts of these two instruments have now been published in the Turkish press.

2. I have the honour to transmit to you the attached copies of the two texts in question as published in French in the Constantinople newspaper the *République*. These French versions correspond with the Turkish versions given in the semi-official newspaper *Hakimiyeti Milliye*.

3. I am sending a copy of this despatch and of its enclosures to His Majesty's Minister in Tehran.

I have, &c.

JAMES MORGAN.

Enclosure 1 in No. 45.

Traité d'Amitié entre la Turquie et la Perse.

LA République turque et l'Empire de Perse, également animés du désir de resserrer les liens d'amitié et de fraternité heureusement existant entre eux, ayant convenu de rétablir, dans un nouveau traité d'amitié, les dispositions des articles de leur traité d'amitié et de sécurité du 22 avril 1926, concernant les relations générales des deux pays, ont, à cette fin, désigné pour leurs plénipotentiaires, savoir :

Le Président de la République turque : son Excellence le Dr. Tevfik Rüştü Bey, Ministre des Affaires étrangères, Député d'Izmir ;

Sa Majesté impériale le Schah de Perse : son Altesse Mirza Mohamed Ali Khan Firoughi, Ministre des Affaires étrangères ;

Lesquels, après s'être communiqué leurs pleins pouvoirs, reconnus en bonne et due forme, sont convenus des dispositions suivantes :

ARTICLE 1er.

Il y aura paix inviolable et amitié sincère et perpétuelle entre la République turque et l'Empire de Perse ainsi qu'entre les ressortissants des deux pays.

ARTICLE 2.

Les hautes parties contractantes conviennent que les représentants diplomatiques et consulaires de chacune d'elles continueront à recevoir sur le territoire de l'autre, à charge de réciprocité, le traitement consacré par les principes et la pratique du droit commun international, traitement qui, en tout cas et également sous condition de réciprocité, ne pourra être moins favorable que le traitement accordé aux représentants diplomatiques et consulaires de la nation la plus favorisée.

ARTICLE 3.

Les hautes parties contractantes sont d'accord pour régler les relations consulaires, commerciales, douanières et de navigation entre leurs pays ainsi que les conditions de la résidence et du séjour des ressortissants de chacune d'elles sur le territoire de l'autre, par des conventions conformes aux principes et à la pratique du droit commun international et sur la base d'une parfaite réciprocité.

ARTICLE 4.

Le précédent [*sic.* ? présent] traité sera ratifié et l'échange des instruments de ratification aura lieu à Téhéran le plus tôt que faire se pourra. Il entrera en vigueur avec l'échange des ratifications.

En foi de quoi, les plénipotentiaires respectifs ont signé le présent traité et y ont apposé leurs sceaux.

Fait en double à Ankara, le 5 novembre 1932

M. A. FIROUGHI. DR. T. RÜSTÜ.

Enclosure 2 in No. 45.

Traité entre la Turquie et la Perse.

LA République turque et l'Empire persan, animés du désir de resserrer les liens de sincère amitié si heureusement existant entre eux, et considérant la nécessité de déterminer les conditions concrètes de leurs rapports politiques et économiques, ont résolu de renouveler leur traité d'amitié et de sécurité du

22 avril 1926 (1er ordibehecht 1305), et ont, à cet effet, désigné pour leurs plénipotentiaires, savoir :

Le Président de la République turque : son Excellence le Dr. Tevfik Rüştü Bey, Ministre des Affaires étrangères, Député d'Izmir ;

Sa Majesté impériale le Schah de Perse : son Altesse Mirza Mohamed Ali Khan Firoughi, Ministre des Affaires étrangères ;

Lesquels, après s'être communiqué leurs pleins pouvoirs, reconnus en bonne et due forme, sont convenus des dispositions suivantes :

ARTICLE 1er.

En cas d'une action militaire dirigée contre l'une des hautes parties contractantes par une ou plusieurs Puissances tierces, l'autre partie contractante s'engage à observer la neutralité vis-à-vis de la première.

ARTICLE 2.

Chacune des deux parties contractantes s'engage à ne se livrer à aucune agression vis-à-vis de l'autre ni à faire partie d'aucune alliance ou entente politique, économique ou financière conclue par une ou plusieurs Puissances tierces et dirigée contre l'autre partie ou contre la sécurité militaire et navale de son pays.

Chacune des deux parties contractantes s'engage en outre à ne pas participer à n'importe quelle action hostile dirigée par une ou plusieurs Puissances tierces contre l'autre partie.

ARTICLE 3.

Au cas où une ou plusieurs Puissances tierces, procédant aux actes d'hostilité et aux opérations militaires contre l'une des hautes parties contractantes, violeraient la neutralité de l'autre partie en vue d'utiliser son territoire pour des passages de troupes, armes, munitions de guerre ou pour des fournitures de vivres, bestiaux et n'importe quelles choses susceptibles de servir à la guerre, ou enfin pour le passage des troupes battant en retraite ou en vue d'exciter et de soulever les populations du territoire neutre dans le but de les employer à leurs fins, ou bien d'opérer des reconnaissances militaires sur ledit territoire, cette partie devra s'opposer par les armes à ces actions pour sauvegarder sa neutralité.

ARTICLE 4.

Au cas où l'une des deux parties contractantes serait l'objet d'une action d'hostilité de la part d'une ou de plusieurs tierces Puissances, l'autre partie contractante déploiera tous ses efforts pour remédier à la situation. Si, malgré ces efforts, la guerre devenait un fait accompli, les deux parties contractantes s'engagent à examiner de nouveau la situation soigneusement et dans un esprit de bienveillance dans le but de parvenir à trouver une solution conforme à leurs intérêts supérieurs.

ARTICLE 5.

Les deux parties contractantes s'engagent à ne point admettre sur leur territoire la formation ou le séjour d'organisations ou de groupements ayant pour but de troubler la paix et la sécurité de l'autre pays ou de changer son gouvernement, ainsi que le séjour de personnes ou de groupements projetant de lutter par propagande ou par tout autre moyen contre l'autre pays.

ARTICLE 6.

Les deux hautes parties contractantes sont d'accord pour régler dans le plus bref délai possible les conditions de leur collaboration dans le domaine économique. Il reste entendu que le choix et le règlement des moyens de la réalisation de cette collaboration ainsi que la question du libre transit à travers les territoires des deux parties et celle de l'établissement des moyens de communication de toutes sortes entre les deux pays seront étudiés soigneusement par les délégués spécialistes compétents qui seront désignés de la part des deux hautes parties contractantes.

ARTICLE 7.

Il est entendu qu'en dehors des engagements mutuels pris dans le présent traité, chacune des hautes parties contractantes conserve son entière liberté d'action en ce qui concerne ses relations avec des tierces Puissances.

ARTICLE 8.

Le présent traité sera ratifié, et les ratifications en seront échangées le plus tôt possible à Téhéran.

Il entrera en vigueur immédiatement après l'échange des ratifications et aura la durée de cinq années. Si le traité n'est pas dénoncé par l'une ou l'autre des hautes parties contractantes six mois avant l'expiration de ladite période de cinq années, il sera considéré comme ayant automatiquement sa durée de validité une année en plus, la dénonciation ne pouvant toujours produire ses effets qu'après l'expiration de six mois.

En foi de quoi, les plénipotentiaires respectifs ont signé le présent traité et y ont apposé leurs sceaux.

Fait à Ankara, en double exemplaire, le 5 novembre 1932.

M. A. FIROUGHI. DR. T. RÜŞTÜ.

o